politics

25¢ a copy

October, 1945

Contents

War as an institution (6): Military Society, by Ed Seldon 290

Commonnonsense, by Niccolo Tucci 293

The Soldier Reports 294

Conscientious Objection in England, by George Woodcock 296

Ancestors (1): PROUDHON

The Relevance of Proudhon, by J. Hampden Jackson 297

P. J. Proudhon: General Idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century (Excerpts) 299

500 Red Army Men, a first-hand report 304

POPULAR CULTURE

Are Hospitals Made for People or Vice Versa, by Nancy Macdonald..... 306

Yaltarian Culture, by Jack Jones 308

Memo to Mr. Luce, by Dwight Macdonald 309

BOOKS

Reviews by Helen Constas and Vera Fulton 311

The Barricade and the Bedroom, by C. Wright Mills and Patricia J. Salter; with a reply by Paul Goodman..... 313

THE INTELLIGENCE OFFICE 317

COMMENT 319

Government Of, By and For, by C. J. Stevens 320

CONTRIBUTORS 313

Here's ONE Thing We Can Do!

An Appeal to the Readers of "Politics"

It is going to be a hard winter in Europe. The hardest in centuries. Harder than any winter during the war. The transport, mining, and industrial system of Europe has been wrecked by high explosives (mostly American). Only supplies from America can keep great numbers of European men, women and children from literally freezing and starving to death this winter.

These supplies will not be forthcoming from "our" Government in sufficient quantity. Its reaction to the problem has all along been callous and hypocritical. In 1942, it promised Europe enough food to "win the war and write the peace." In November, 1943, Roosevelt told UNRRA's first meeting: "We mean business in this war in the political and humanitarian sense just as surely as we mean business in the military sense." These pledges have been broken, again and again.

¶ In the fall of 1944, canned goods were taken off ration. Result: a shortage the following spring which caused cancellation of US commitments to European relief.

¶ Early in 1945, the US Government cut Lend-Lease food commitments in half (although American civilians are consuming more food per capita this year than they did in 1935-9).

¶ On March 21, 1945, Director Lehman of UNRRA asked for 5,000 tons of meat from the USA for the second quarter of the year. "This means a subtraction of only 1.4 ounces of meat from the quarterly supply of each U. S. consumer." He didn't get it. And on June 1, the US Government cancelled ALL shipments of meat abroad through September.

¶ On August 21, President Truman suddenly scrapped Lend-Lease, immediately and completely. Thus the chief source of food imports for England, France and other Western European countries was cut off at the beginning of the continent's worst winter.

¶ Within a month after V-J Day, most rationing over here was abolished. Meat and butter, cigarettes and gasoline are now plentiful. It will NOT be a hard winter in the USA. (On September 9, Canada reimposed meat rationing in order to be sure of supplies to ship abroad to England and Europe.)

Thus it has been the Government of the USA—the one great country in the world whose population dressed, ate and lived BETTER during the war then they had in peace time—it has been the Government of this relatively rich, fat and prosperous nation that has been mainly responsible for cutting off relief supplies to starving Europe.

This is a scandal and a disgrace. But — for once — it is a disgrace that each of us can do something about personally.

What "our" Government will not do, we can do. What the state will not do, the individual can do. What will not be done on a big, organized scale, can be done on a small, personal scale. Not so effectively, more wastefully — but still, to some extent, done.

Food packages can be mailed to Europe. We have the food over here and, most of us, the money to buy it. This winter we can, individually, express our sympathy with starving Europe by mailing abroad as many food packages as we can afford. And here, too, incidentally, is something which those who have criticized the magazine's "negativism" must admit is positive and constructive!

(SEE BACK COVER FOR WHAT *YOU* CAN DO.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War as an Institution (6)

MILITARY SOCIETY

THE writer is about to depart overseas after three years' service as an enlisted man in the American Army. He would like to outline here a view of the modern armed forces which he believes more adequate to the historical situation than the popular views of most civilians or the exceedingly partial ones of many intellectuals. It is the writer's impression that, in general, the pacifists know more about modern armies than any other contemporary radical or liberal group. Bartholemy de Ligt, for example, has obviously studied modern military organization and the relation of armies to their civilian societies. Liberal and radical intellectuals, in general, confine themselves to the narrowly political results of warfare with as little concern for the issues presented here as the sentimental pacifists who reduce current history to a single moral alternative. Possibly I have not covered the field adequately, but aside from POLITICS and some of the studies of the pacifists I know of no non-militarist publications during this war that discuss intelligently or usefully the life I, for one, have been pursuing.

In the United States I have encountered among civilians two prevalent views of what it is like to be "serving one's country." Male civilians of draft age prefer to think of soldiers, like themselves, *doing a job*. Recruitment publicity for "The Modern Army" complements this view with a great deal of emphasis on technological training. Advertising artists present the handsome half-naked American in the Jungle, alone with his walkie-talkie (the same one the "defense" worker has fitted the parts for), dreaming of a better job under better working conditions Back Home. Among female civilians the more popular view is the traditional one of the Fighting Man—Killer Joe—a role enforced, willy-nilly by the combined publicity forces at the disposal of the Army. This view is repeated in the civilian's emphasis upon actual warfare as the principal activity of the soldier's life. In reality, actual warfare occupies moments, or at most days, of most soldiers' years of service. Obviously, the infantryman, both in training and experience, sees more of the life of perpetual combat pictured by the average civilian than a soldier of other branches. It would be interesting, however, to speculate as to how much of any soldier's after-the-event emphasis on his actual combat experience is the effect of civilian curiosity and pressure. And it is important to remember the very large proportion of servicemen whose principal memory of their war experience will be, not combat, but those other aspects of military life which I propose to discuss.

NEVER before in history has man mobilized such huge armies as are contending in this war. Every color of skin in every color of uniform is marching today—recruited, trained, rationed, housed, and deployed by the various nations. To achieve the organization of these vast forces, great pyramidal structures, based on the authority principle and hierarchical in nature, have been created. There is an astonishing resemblance between them, whatever the differences in the civil societies that produced them. (A very valuable study could be made by a military scholar equipped to compare the armed services of the various powers. He might investigate the combat soldier's impression that the children of light and the children of darkness are distressingly alike when suffering from the same wounds or rotting, dead, under the same sun.)

The man who enters the armed services of his country becomes the "citizen" of a totalitarian society. This society is based upon absolute authority and backed up by threat of death in many forms. It is this salient fact which, it seems to me, has been neglected by almost all writers dealing with the subject at hand. This neglect is begotten, in part at least, by the feeling, inherited probably from the American past, that war is something "temporary", passing, a storm to be endured. America's past wars have been of short duration; the organization required to fight them has been extemporaneous in nature—in brief the effect on the social organization has been small. We are not yet aware of the implications of life under a highly-organized, all-pervading totalitarian society, which has now endured long enough to leave some permanent traces upon the individuals who have lived under it.

The organization of the Army, for example, is perfectly pyramidal and more tightly knit by the hierarchic principle of rank than any civilian society of our day, including the most totalitarian. The nature of this organization is scarcely veiled by recruitment publicity or the Public Relations Office of the Secretary of War. Any soldier, and many civilians, are free to examine Army Regulations,

politics

VOLUME 2, NO. 10 (Whole No. 21) OCTOBER, 1945

Business Manager: Nancy Macdonald
Circulation Manager: Dorothy Brumm
Editor: Dwight Macdonald

POLITICS is published monthly at 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y., by Politics Publishing Co. Telephone: GRamercy 3-1512.

Subscription $2.50 for one year, $4 for two years. Add 30c a year for Canada, 50c a year for all other foreign countries. Single copy: 25c. Most back issues are still available.

Special rate for service men and C.O.'s anywhere: $1.75 a year.

Copyright October, 1945, by Politics Publishing Co.

Entered as second-class matter March 16, 1944, at the post-office at New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

85

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which, with the supplementary decrees of the various administrative divisions, constitute the most complete authoritarian ordering of a society—in practice, not merely in theory—conceived since St. Thomas Aquinas, (though in a spirit somewhat less humanistic).*

In a democratic society (and any civil society is democratic in comparison with any military society of our day), authority and responsibility operate in a complex, relatively humane fashion, determined at least theoretically by the citizen himself, his needs, and wishes. In the authoritarian society of the armed forces, however, responsibility can only be downward, toward the lower ranks; and authority lies only in one direction: upward. The soldier, therefore, is the subject, not the object, of his society—as he half recognizes in the training-camp humor of "Why don't you write a letter to Mrs. Roosevelt?"

The soldier soon learns that any complaint or request for explanation will be rationalized, if at all, in terms of "military necessity." Further, when he has accepted "military necessity" for what it is worth—i. e., has stopped complaining and never asks for explanations of anything—he discovers himself beginning to be accepted as a "citizen in good standing" of his society. He may even be eligible for advancement, if he is very diligent and lucky as well. "Military necessity" of course, is a very elastic phrase that covers every possible negative circumstance of life in uniform, from a shortage of toilet paper to a crushing defeat. Most soldiers find a single four-letter word more expressive, and semantically as apt.

AND then, there is tradition. Once upon a time there was a very young and conscientious First Lieutenant, who found himself Mess Officer of a new and struggling outfit. He performed his duties to the satisfaction of his Commanding Officer, but more than that, by his comportment and military bearing impressed everyone as being the very model of a young officer and an ornament to any Staff. Becoming conscious of the esteem in which he was universally held, emboldened further by his youth and desire to move on to further triumph, our Lieutenant considered the institution of Early Chow, which, being Mess Officer, fell within his proper jurisdiction. It has been since who knows how long the custom for Army Messes all over the globe to prepare food for the customary three meals some time in advance of the major serving. This practice is necessitated by the institution of Early Chow, that is, the early feeding of charge-of-quarters, relief drivers, and other personnel who have to remain on duty while the bulk of the organization have their proper chow at the proper times. How Wasteful, considered the young Lieutenant, how indeed Inefficient: why should the majority of men have to consume Cold or even Half-Cold Chow, simply because the duties of a few individuals require their absence at the scheduled meal? *Why not a Late Chow for charge of quarters and relief drivers and the other special duty personnel?* Let *them* be penalized—in any case they perform their irregular duties on a rotation basis, and should be willing to consume Cold Chow occasionally if it meant Hot Chow at every regular messing. Why, millions of enlisted men would thank him!

It is typical of the gulf between soldiers and civilians that the latter suppose there must be more to this story.

FROM the political point of view, even more important than the totalitarian aspect of army life is the relation between army and civil society. This *imperium in imperio*, the modern army, is in contact with the civilian State only at the very top of its pyramidal structure. Only through the Secretary of War's Office, as a civilian ministry, can outside influence touch this organization. How much weakened this slight contact is by the time it has been funnelled down through "channels" to the lower stages of the hierarchy, can easily be imagined. (The Italian Army term "*vie gerarchiche*" — literally: "*hierarchical ways*" — is a more adequate expression than our "channels".)

Modern armies pretend to be, as if by definition, "above" politics. Probably—especially in countries where the Army is a major social institution in time of peace—it does require a measure of independence from the civil regimes as a condition of support. Nevertheless, in the most sensitive portion of its structure, the apex of the hierarchical pyramid, it is quite as political as any other institution of the State. The higher one goes in the hierarchy, the more politics—in the broad sense of the term—one encounters.

But in a curious, almost a perverted, sense, the armed forces are indeed above politics. They need be concerned only with such amoral goals as "the enemy", "the objective", "the mission", "orientation" and other scrupulously scientifically pure concepts. These in combination with the equally scientific elements of logistics, ballistics, radio, and the whole field of modern technology including medicine, psychiatry, and modern advertising produce a truly stunning rationale of why and how what-must-be . . . must-be. The armed services are "above politics" in that they are instruments of a society which has already asserted its "war aims." The armed services have not declared war, after all, any more than the psychiatrist has caused his patient's schizophrenia. Their role properly understood is to execute the technical operations necessary to win the war (or to "adjust" the patient to reality). Moral and political questions have been answered in advance; the identity of "the enemy", the over-all "mission", and the ultimate military "objective" are so many givens in an equation that could only be questioned by a soldier willing and able to conceive another kind of algebra.

Nowhere is this essential purity of the rationale (that is, its complete reliance upon the fallacy of the experimental situation wholly beyond the subject's control) more evident than in the Orientation Program of the United States Army. Films, booklets, posters, synthetic "bull-sessions" in the company areas, and compulsory lectures by specially trained officers, counsel the enlisted man, for example, to "Know Your Enemy." Incidentally very educational, especially the documentary films, the Orientation Program is a worthy monument to the liberals who doubtless insisted upon it. It is possible to learn that the Nazis follow anti-Semitic policies; that in the Russian language "bolshevik" means merely "majority"; that all Japanese

*Army Regulations lack only the arguments from objection (in retrospect, a *humane* touch) to be a veritable *Summa*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are fanatically devoted to their Emperor; that the English and the Chinese are brave peoples; that France fell because the French differed among themselves—in short that God is good and the devil bad. One is subjected to an orgy of miscellaneous information provided in various media, and accompanied by exhortations to "sound off" and say what *you* think—about anything. Most soldiers have a vast distrust of any soldier who would do so—if only because it is a sound rule of thumb that anything an officer exhorts you to do will get you in trouble or be pointless. (The writer has almost without exception exhibited his solidarity with this attitude.) Seriously to attempt to raise issues of war and peace in an Army Orientation program would be as though the schizophrenic patient were to question the brand of "reality" his psychiatrist was adjusting him to. Indeed, the writer knows of a case where the Army psychiatrist characterized an individual who had done just that as having "marked schizoid trends."

THE question naturally arises, at this point, how does the American soldier, citizen of a relatively easy-going civil society, react to this kind of environment. He gripes incessantly, and in homage to some ideal of freedom occasionally makes serious problems for his superior officers. "Old Army" officers frequently never get over their misgivings as to the soldierliness of the draftee. They long for the good old days when the First Sergeant took recalcitrants out behind the mess hall and gave them a good beating, while the CO looked the other way (or watched from a window against which the sun was shining).

The merely war-time soldier who does not want to stay in a minute longer than he has to, has a special psychology which effectually prevents him from generalizing objectively about his experience. This civilian-soldier, who, since the French revolutionary wars, has made up the bulk of the armed services in time of war, never really likes very much the life he leads under arms. Every free moment snatched from the onerous routine and the long dull stretches of waiting is spent either in play, or in the exercise of that former, civilian self, the "real" ego, in phantasy. He writes home; he tells his barrack and squad mates about his past life in intimate detail; he plans possible futures and dreams impossible ones. When this cannot sustain him, he gets drunk, gambles, chases women, plays baseball, or merely sleeps a good deal. The rougher the time he is having—as in combat—the more vivid becomes the daydreams of this other, former personality. At the same time the fewer are the free and unfatigued moments in which it might be possible to measure this dream-life against actual reality. Ultimately, he meets the irresolvable contradiction of his position—the longing to be a civilian which clashes with the psychological necessities of soldiering. If, for one moment, he came to realize that he is not really a soldier—that he is not really a member of a glorious company, making the most solemn *devoir* of his life—he would be robbed of all that keeps him going.

It is important to understand, in this connection, that although the civilian soldier of the great modern armies may not come up to the highest standards of the military profession itself, the very fact that he *is* a civilian at heart makes it possible for him to "stand" warfare of a ferocity it may be questioned merely mercenary, professional soldiers would be willing to "stand." The mercenary character of 17th and 18th century armies was one reason for the small amount of bloodshed in the battles of that idyllic era of "limited warfare". The non-professional citizens armies initiated by the French Revolution and developed by Napoleon were the first big step toward modern "total warfare".

BUT what about "war aims"—what of the reasons why the individual patriot goes to war? This is, after all, a total war, and a totalitarian army is needed to fight our totalitarian enemies. At worst, it is only a temporary incarceration (a short course at Dachau), with more or less definite goals to be achieved, on the attainment of which the country has set its collective heart in unswerving collective unity. In the pages of this magazine, it is surely unnecessary to examine the political aspects of this. Extremely pertinent, however, is the single issue of the relevance of "war-aims" to the experience of the man in uniform.

Presumably they should transform the soldier's life by giving meaning and dignity to his suffering. Actually they are a civilian preoccupation that can continue to interest the soldier of a modern army only in the marginal area where phantasy still gives him a kind of freedom. They exist in the suppressed civilian ego, which, in spite of his new environment, still remains with the citizen-soldier.

This question may be most sharply defined, perhaps if the reader will imagine himself in British uniform during the late unpleasantness in Greece. Suppose you knew, being both bright and with liberal beliefs intact, just what an approaching attack on an ELAS strongpoint meant, in relation to your individual "war-aims." (More likely, as an enlisted man, you would have only a dim idea of the political alignment against you, and would have been told quite another story by your officers—but we are just supposing.) What, as a soldier, could you do? *First*, you could refuse to participate. *Second*, you could refuse to participate yourself and endeavor to persuade your comrades to do likewise. *Third*, you could wound yourself or manage to be ill, so as to avoid at least individual feelings of guilt by being "unable" to participate. *Fourth*, you could participate and try to desert to the other side. *Fifth*, you could participate and do your best not to hurt the enemy, or try to make your group lose. Any of these courses of action might be more honorable than participation in the operation here hypothesized, certainly more in keeping with the "war-aims" which are supposed to be those of your nation. And each of them is a violation of the most basic laws of modern armies, punishable by death on the battlefield, or by court martial leading to the death sentence.

THE secret source of strength upon which modern man in uniform draws so heavily, sufficient, it would seem, to carry him through the worst these times have yet provided, is the external, formal integration that membership in a military society demands. The shoeclerk, the machine operator, the journalist, the taxi-driver throw back their shoulders, discover fresh air and the elements, stand up straight and tighten their belly muscles. It feels good to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discover the appetites where before was routine indulgence; to look at an horizon instead of a window; to recapture the adolescent delights of wholly masculine companionship. It is not necessary to worry about losing one's job, or getting enough to eat: if the subsistence is minimal, everyone at least shares alike. However forced, however synthetic, the solidarity with one's comrades may be, it is nevertheless solidarity such as civil society seldom affords. In a uniform, the sensibility becomes coarsened, the imagination is exercised only in pure phantasy, and fewer and fewer pressures to intellectual effort are encountered. If the civilian "real" ego is pushed into a corner of consciousness, this is partly a relief, insofar as crushing responsibilities, personal and social, may be tucked away with it. In comparison with the civilian who went away, families and friends frequently find in the returned soldier a man strangely humanized by his experience of suffering, more mature, seemingly surer of himself, free of superfluous mannerisms and quirks of temperament. As is well known, military service makes a "man" of you. And so it does, in direct proportion to the quantities of false values, artificial habits, inhuman pressures and partial satisfactions of the civilian society one has escaped from.

Something like this is the basic of all totalitarian allegiances: a minimal certainty is preferable to the richest, ripest confusions and uncertainties. A formal integration from outside, or from above, is preferable to an integration from within, because it is easier. One is exhausted with the intricacies of technology, the capriciousness of economics, and the murderous competition with one's fellows.

Nor is this appeal to "order", in the scholastic sense, limited to the underdogs of modern society. Neo-Thomist intellectuals celebrate it at dignified and beautiful Roman and Anglo-Catholic altars in many countries; Stalinists are drugged with the simplicity of its appeal; liberal intellectuals and artists, from Ernie Pyle and Harry Brown to the nameless legion of editorial writers, advertising artists and front-line correspondents, are one in the glorification of its secondary attributes: comradeship, the dignity of death and suffering, the sheer power of populations galvanized to superhuman feats of endurance and energy by the simple device of declaring a moratorium on individual responsibility—beg pardon—"mobilization".

This then, must be the "typical experience" of my generation: the displacement of the idea of freedom by the idea of order, and the relegation of freedom itself to play and phantasy.

IN these notes, the writer has tried to describe the contemporary soldier as the citizen of a certain kind of a society, alien in many respects to the civil society whose rights he no longer enjoys, though of its own and his own creation. The principal characteristics of this military society have been sketched, particularly at those points where certain mistaken notions about it are currently popular. There remains, however, on the writer's part, almost a kind of despair, at bridging the gap between soldier experience and civilian sensibility so as to make the former accessible to the latter. It is, of course, a task for a master novelist, and these remarks could scarcely serve him even as notes.

ED SELDON

Commonnonsense

I TOO, want to say something about the atomic bomb. I have discovered the only element that will not be destroyed by it. Iron and steel may go up in the air like smoke; but listen to this, from Mr. Stimson's statement announcing the Great Event to the world:

"... Every effort is being bent toward assuring that this weapon and the new field of science that stands behind it will be employed wisely in the interests of the security of the peace-loving nations and the well-being of the world."

From under the ashes of the world there will emerge again the only thing that is eternal: this kind of stupidity. Indeed it will not only emerge; the atom bomb will bring the echo of human stupidity to the feet of the gods. The stars will tremble with the vibrations of a Truman's or a Stimson's voice.

Quite apart from the fact that Mr. Stimson would do better if he stopped "bending every effort" and "assuring the wise employment of this weapon," because he too may be disintegrated by it, may we, the people, ask THEM to disperse our ill-assembled atoms WITHOUT SPEECHES. Detonation; that's all we need. And when I say THEY I don't mean people who are supposedly bad because they are a bunch of Churchills, Stalins, Attlees or other atomic fools. I mean those who will handle the weapon at all times. If we, the oppressed, the repressed, the wise, the know-betters, were to attain our goal of bettering the world by substituting our own hand for theirs, we would be THEY, I would be one of THEM; I wouldn't speak this way. Someone else would, whose chance to do the "perfect thing" has not come up yet. And, being in the right, he would receive from me, and my like in power, the ritual of disintegration in the best interests of the security of the peace-loving sonofabitch.

Those who still wish to put their protest on record, have but one thing to do: take an old-fashioned pistol, and, before shooting themselves with it, shout proudly: MY death is not going to make Booooom and go into a 60.000 feet high geyser of elements: it's going to make Pim, all by itself. My private entrance into Nothing.

WHEN I saw Mr. Byrnes' statement on page one of the *N. Y. Times*, to the effect that Japan was already defeated when the bomb was thrown, I thought: at least one of these public geniuses comes out against it. But what did I read in the statement proper? Byrnes didn't want the credit to be taken away from the boys who fought and died in the Pacific. Fine. How about the credit he thus bestows upon those who prepared and threw the bomb on a vanquished people?

"To the extent that the bomb had facilitated the surrender" (don't Americans just love to facilitate things), "it saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of American soldiers and it saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of Japanese boys and millions more of Japanese people. It saved more lives than were lost, Mr. Byrnes declared."

Now, really, Mr. Byrnes, if you go on saving as many lives as all that, you may bring about a sudden increase in the population of the globe, beyond the functioning of certain economic laws which must remain undisturbed. Stop saving lives, for God's sake! More birth control and less atomic bombs; the world is crowded enough as it is.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE first article on the bombing of Nagasaki written by Mr. Laurence for the *New York Times*, which article Mr. La Guardia, with his fine flair for what is of educational value, suggested all the kids be given to read in school, contains two gems. One is this:

"The briefing period ended with a moving prayer by the chaplain." (Sssst. Let's pray.)

And here is the second: "Our weather planes ahead of us are on their way to find out where the wind blows. Half an hour before target time *we will know what the winds have decided.*" (Italics mine.)

Now, mark this: it's the winds that decide on the punishment to be taken by the one or the other city. He had said in the preceding paragraph that "*three towns that must stay unnamed were spared by the fact that it was a cloudy day down there.*"

I can picture a citizen of Nagasaki saying to his children a few seconds before eight o'clock that fateful morning: "Gee, I'm glad it's a bright day today; I was so afraid we would have rain." And, thousands of feet above him, there goes the science of Mr. Laurence, saying: "In one-tenth of a millionth of a second, a fraction of time immeasurable by any clock, a whirlwind from the skies will pulverize thousands of its buildings and tens of thousands of its inhabitants. Does one feel any pity or compassion for the poor devils about to die? Not when one thinks of Pearl Harbor...."

Because of course there is God, to Whom the Chaplain addresses a moving prayer, before the "heroes" start on their Life Saving Mission. Then there is God's personal hangman, Mr. Laurence of the *New York Times*, who did it all voluntarily, because he was thinking of Pearl Harbor all the time. In fact, it is known that he had never been drafted by the army, he had never bothered to study nuclear physics before; he was just an ignorant, idle young man, until, on a certain day in his life, he heard of Pearl Harbor and said: My, I must do something about it! Like Saint Francis centuries ago, he gave up all worldly goods, but instead of lingering in useless prayer, he studied physics in a hurry, and worked on the atomic bomb without ever drawing ONE CENT of salary: all and only because of Pearl Harbor. At times, while he was working on the project, they had to shake him out of his obsession and shout at him: "Stop thinking of Pearl Harbor, for God's sake! Think of your job here...."

Well, having thus completed his training as a Chastiser, Laurence ascended in a B-29, and FINALLY (O Great Day for the Glory of the Lord; O Day of Atonement), punished the people who had done wrong, selecting them with painful care from among those

IN WHOSE DIRECTION THE WIND BLOWS . . .

What safer, what more objective method of justice? (In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Atom.)

And then, besides the Chaplain and the Chastiser, there are the Bastards who die of burns, out of sheer propaganda, to exploit American soft-heartedness. Suppose a number of those Bastards were dying weeks after the same kind of raid, only in New York, and not in Nagasaki. Would they deserve any sympathy?

Here's a great problem for the Moral Geographer!

FUNNIEST of all performances in this last act of the World's Comedy was the demonstration given by the scientists themselves, with instruments at hand and newsreels fifteen miles away, that there was little left of the original radio-activity unleashed by the first test-bomb. Poor darlings, they had been unjustly accused; of course they would never do such a bad thing to mankind.

Now it is no secret that those unfortunate physicists, now virtual prisoners of the country for which they work, are so cynical, that all this talk about fascism and communism and democracy and the great ideals cannot even make them laugh any more. In fact, nothing can make them laugh. What they know is that it would take very little to return this planet to its original state of incandescense. Many new stars have appeared in the sky in recent years; and they are nothing but former planets promoted to the degree of suns. After all, planets are an exception in the universe. Rub the head of a match too strongly and then see what happens. This is what those scientists know, and they don't give a good goddam about the burns caused by radio-activity and the rules of international law in warfare. If they bother to go and measure radio-activity, and smile in front of the news-reel photographer (and the Military Police behind him), they do so only because they are slaves and cowards, exactly as the Nazis under Hitler and the Fascists under Mussolini. Wasn't it all in the papers, that the Nagasaki bomb had made the Hiroshima bomb "obsolete" and that only one-tenth of one per cent of the available energy was being used now? Are we really expected to be so foolish as to believe that those crude beasts have become soft-hearted all of a sudden because a group of clergymen protests the consequences of the bomb, and that they will give up "improving" their invention now, and deliver the next bombs "without radio-activity," as the butcher would deliver you the meat "without bones?"

Logically speaking, the next bombs are BOUND to be so radio-active that not seventy, but seven thousand years after the great day of the explosion, the little fountain of death will still be there, joyously sprinkling in the air.

If there is to be any air by then.

One thing is sure, though: if there is any air, there will also be a statesman blabbing nonsense into it.

NICCOLO TUCCI

The Soldier Reports

Chicago, Ill.

Until quite recently, I've been working for the outfit that has done all the Army's public opinion polling inside the Army. Largely, of course, it's a matter of uncovering the trouble spots so the big boys can pour oil where it's most needed.... Partly, as in the case of the much-publicized point system, it's a matter of getting specious sanction for what the big boys want to do. (If the men had *their* way about the point system—a poll *was* taken last fall—the relative values of dependents, combat and length of service would be quite different.)

But the people actually doing the research have, in the main, been trying to do a decent job, and have managed to turn up a lot of stuff that would be very useful indeed to somebody interested in knowing exactly what the Army means to the Joes in it....They are going to make an effort to get the raw material (filled-out questionnaires and punched cards) turned over to the Social Science Research Council or some other outfit of the kind.

They managed to do a little study, for example, among infantry companies which contained a Negro platoon. (At the time of the Ardennes offensive, the big boys got desper-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ate and recruited Negro infantry volunteers from among the service troops.) 85% of the whites in such companies favored the arrangement, and almost as large a percentage believed the Negroes fought as well as the whites. The whole study runs like that, and completely upsets the traditional Army arguments for segregation.

There is another thing I'd like to mention, for what it may be worth to you people. I've had a lot of interviews with men just back from combat in Europe. And I've been appalled at the extent of looting and all-round debauch these guys engaged in, with the permission and participation of their officers, especially after the war was over. It is literally true that many of the men, especially officers, lived more freely—in the worst sense—in the weeks immediately following the German surrender than they are ever likely to be able to live again—and they remember it as a delicious experience. Women, liquor, shooting up the town, generally humiliating and intimidating Germans, enforcing any demands for goods or services, systematic and destructive looting of homes.... It's quite remarkable that this whole business has been kept out of print. I wonder what our top military think about it? A necessary release? Part of the traditional fruits of victory? Something they wanted to control but couldn't? Quite consciously a means of increasing goodwill toward the Army and Army life?

Luxembourg

...I made the trip in a second-class compartment with four other soldiers, all of them infantrymen who had seen just enough fighting to find out what it was like. One was 23 and came from a small Tennessee town; he had a 19-year-old wife and five children (two sets of twins) and was planning to re-enlist for overseas duty, go home on a 90-day furlough, and spend 20 years serving overseas, then retire in his 40's. Next there was a 19-year-old boy, from Baltimore and Chicago, who was thinking of doing the same thing. Third, another kid of 19 who hadn't much to say except to tell us about a couple of girls he had made by driving them out into the country and threatening to make them walk back. The fourth was an older man, about 35 or so, who kept laughing when he thought what his wife would do if she ever found out what he had done in Nice.

The conversation started pleasantly. They told me how they had found four whores living in the hotel across from their quarters who had become fast friends of theirs and with whom they would sleep after the girls had finished their day's work. During the day, the girls would buy them drinks, and one of them even gave the older soldier money when his own ran out. He said that if only they had left town in the early morning, he could have taken a rather good watch with him which belonged to "his" whore. He stated this in a perfectly good-humored way, with comic regret. Then the one from Baltimore said he could have taken practically anything from his girl, but every time he tried, he couldn't bring himself to it. He just took a liking to that little girl, it seems. Finally, Tennessee told us that, when he found he had to leave Monday, he had borrowed 800 francs ($16) from *his* girl, which he had promised to pay back Wednesday.

All this was told as a big joke, with a great deal of vivid description and stories about drunken brawls. I don't think any malevolence was involved. It was simply a case of dulled, or perhaps undeveloped, sensibilities. Enjoyment to these men meant violence—anything else would have failed to touch them.

The most significant part of the talk came later, when they began to tell me about their experiences at the front. Baltimore began with the tale of a champagne cache his company had found, during the final break-through in the West. They left the place loaded down, inside and outside, piling the bodies of those who passed out into a jeep. What they couldn't take with them, he said gleefully, they smashed. That started it. Tennessee explained that when he found anything "nice" that he couldn't take along, he made sure that nobody else would be able to use it. Then the older one began to list all the "real expensive, modern stuff—furniture and all that" he had ripped and smashed with his bayonet and rifle. Lucky ones had sent whole silver services home. The climax came when Baltimore told about a friend who was "a swell guy to search houses with—he just didn't give a damn." Baltimore guessed the Germans would be ten years putting back all the doors they'd blown off their hinges. One time they found a German soldier who'd taken his clothes off and gone to bed. They took his pistol and shot him in the head and left. Then there was an old man they'd shot in bed because they didn't like the way he acted. After another shooting, they'd almost got caught when the company commander heard two shots and came running over to see what was the matter. They told him they'd blown two doors in. Luckily, he didn't go upstairs to look.

All this was just good clean fun. They were not sadists, not neurotic—just healthy, under average mentally, and sprung from inadequate environments. If you seek an answer as to where the Nazis found tools for their work, here it is. Put him in a certain environment—whether the Nazis or the U. S. Army provides it, is indifferent—and an insensitive, ill-reared boy of 19 can do things that make headlines in the newspapers, and do them without compunction.

This isn't the only time I've heard stories like these, either. They come up all the time. This is merely an especially pointed case.

Editor's Note: For obvious reasons, very little has appeared in our press about the wholesale looting American soldiers went in for in Europe. A great deal has appeared, on the other hand, about looting and raping by the Red Army, again for obvious reasons. From what evidence I have seen, I'd say the Red Army has considerably surpassed our own troops in these exploits, especially the second. But it is by no means the black-and-white contrast suggested by our own press. In support of the testimony of the two above letters, three further bits of evidence may be cited: (1) Two long letters from British and Canadian officers which were printed in Common Wealth Review *(London) for May, 1945. "Systematic and widespread pillage of civilian homes and shops . . . all the safes in the town had been forced open and the money stolen by Allied troops . . . regrettable but very widespread cases of pillage and even wholesale rape." .....(2) Two letters from U. S. sergeants printed in* Time *for Sept. 17, 1945. "Our own Army and the British have done their share of looting and raping . . . Germany has been picked clean by our troops . . . common knowledge that American soldiers are* persona non grata *in the homes of decent girls in many of the liberated countries." (3) A dispatch by David Anderson from Belgium in* N. Y. Times *of Sept. 11, 1945. "The conduct of the American GI and of his officers has . . . become so bad in western Europe that responsible quarters are very much concerned . . . our troops on leave are showing no discretion in the approach to women . . . A Belgian: 'They must learn to respect our country, even if they have no self-respect'."*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conscientious Objection in England

A GROUP of articles and letters in the June, 1945, issue of POLITICS gives encouraging news of the development of a revolutionary social consciousness among American conscientious objectors. In England, a similar development has taken place.

Over here, there were more C.O.'s than in America, and, as the exemptions were somewhat easier to obtain, the proportion of registered C.O.'s to the whole population was very much higher. The presence of a category of completely exempted objectors, who often remained at their peacetime work, and the absence of great segregational camps like the American C.P.S. camps, made it more easy for C.O.'s to keep contact with normal civilian life, while at the same time their numbers made it possible for a special C.O. environment and consciousness to arise within the wartime society. C.O.'s had common problems and a common enemy, the state, and it was natural that they should discuss continually their relationship to society in general and to the governmental machine in particular.

It was among the conditionally exempted objectors that the problems became most acute. The few unconditionally exempted men had little trouble from the state, and those whose applications were rejected had a more or less clear choice between sacrificing their principles and going into prison. But for the conditionally exempted men there was the tempting offer of a compromise with the state, which most of them at first accepted. Three attitudes became evident among them. One group, consisting almost wholly of religious objectors of nonconformist sects other than the Quakers, compromised with the state in everything except actual killing and accepted their toil with what might be called Christian fortitude or despicable inertia, according to one's point of view. A second group, consisting in part of religious objectors, such as Quakers, and in part of humanitarian pacifists, found some virtue in landwork as the possible basis for a new attitude to society, and broke away from the direct employment of the state to form a series of communities which had definite political theories and envisaged farming as the foundation of a society built up from a network of small autonomous communities. A third group, consisting mostly of humanitarian and political objectors, with a few individual Quakers and Catholics, gradually evolved a revolutionary attitude of direct struggle against the state.

I think my own wartime history is perhaps typical of that of many members of the third group. I started the war as a humanitarian objector with leftish political sympathies—I was an inactive member of the I. L. P. I went first for three months to an agricultural community, but found the course which these people pursued was so much isolated from that of the surrounding society that it did not satisfy my growing feeling of the need for some radical social transformation.

Accordingly, I left the community and went to work directly under the state, in the employment of a War Agricultural Committee. Here there were two groups of objectors, seperately organised for working purposes, and the contrast between these groups was surprising. The first consisted of religious objectors, who were obedient workers and whose foremen ruled them like sergeant majors. The second consisted of humanitarian objectors, with a few politicals, and it was the despair of the agricultural authorities.

To a man, the C. O.'s in this group were opposed to the repressive system which the authorities tried to impose on them, and in a very short time they became organized for struggle. Those who had previously no political attitude became as militant as the others. Just before I joined them they had fought a strike lasting some weeks, with no funds and no previous experience of industrial struggle. There were only two blacklegs. During the six months I stayed with them their attitude was militant throughout. They would down tools at the least excuse. They never worked at anything more than a go-slow pace, and they indulged in plenty of deliberately bad work in order to inconvenience the authorities. They boycotted any foreman who tried to be domineering, until these minor officials chose to accept the situation. The men who acted like this, it should be noted, were not, for the most part, proletarians. The most militant among them were poets, painters, architects, clerks, students, librarians and journalists.

Finally, about a third of the C. O.'s walked off the field in the middle of harvest and left the War Agricultural Committee for good. I was one of this group. During this period of six month's contact with the state machinery for dealing with C. O.'s, my whole attitude had crystallised from a vague humanitarianism into a clearly-understood revolutionary anarchism. From a somewhat airy feeling that war was due to "something wrong in society," I had come to realise that it could only be ended by a really radical change in the whole social structure, both economic and political. From that time I became an active worker in the anarchist movement. My own story is typical of that of many other C. O.'s who have found themselves engaged in a guerilla warfare of direct action against the state.

So far as any movement represents this tendency among C. O.'s, it is the anarchist movement. During the last war, the I.L.P. was the political movement of the C.O.'s, but this time the C.O.'s have moved further to the left, and at present a majority of the active anarchists in England are young men who started the war as C.O.'s with no defined political attitude of any kind. A few social-democrats still survive in high places in the pacifist movement, but even in bureaucratic organizations like the Peace Pledge Union, the general movement of political consciousness is steadily towards anarchism, and a number of Tolstoyan groups are springing up beside the anarcho-syndicalist movement represented by *War Commentary* and the strong literary anarchism among C.O. writers.

Meanwhile, the C. O.'s who do not care to accept any further compromise with the state, and at the same time are not inclined for propagandist activity, have indulged in varying forms of resistance or evasion. A large number went on the run and evaded the police for long periods, often for years. Some of them hid in the country, but there was more safety among the crowds of the large cities, and most of them moved to London and Glasgow, where they formed whole networks of co-operative endeavour, helping each other with work, shelter, etc., and receiving assistance from many sympathetic people. Some had enough money to enable them to live without facing the problem of immediate work, but others had to find employment in a number of obscure occupations which, for obvious reasons, I cannot discuss in detail. A number of young intellectuals were among this C. O. underground, which was closely linked,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for reasons of security, with the fringe of the criminal underworld, and they have learnt a good deal from this experience. One of them, a young poet whose work has appeared recently in a number of English magazines, is writing what looks like becoming a very good novel on his life on the run.

I was in contact with this movement for nearly two years after I left the land, when I was nominally in hiding. During this time I wrote under my own name in many magazines and published two books, but for some reason the authorities avoided following these obvious clues. Six months ago I decided to change my policy and come into the open, but the bureaucracy have still taken no decisive action to try and get me to do war work. This, I think, is typical of their new attitude towards C.O.'s, which is to leave them alone if they appear troublesome and which I am sure is due only to our militancy.

Because they have gained little publicity, it must not be imagined that the C. O.'s are at all insignificant over here. After the last war, objectors formed a large proportion of the Labour M. P.'s returned to parliament. This time they are standing aside from parliamentary politics, and their abstention may be as important as their participation was before, for it comes from equally strong social feelings.

GEORGE WOODCOCK

Ancestors (1)

PROUDHON

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the first of a series of articles by and about such political thinkers of the past as Diderot, Condorcet, Tom Paine, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Herzen, Kropotkin, Tolstoy, Daniel De Leon, and Rosa Luxembourg. The names, it will be noted, are mostly of non-Marxists. This is because (1) Marxism is already widely familiar to American intellectuals (perhaps disproportionately so); (2) the contemporary crisis of socialism demands that we supplement and reshape the Marxist heritage with the aid of "Utopian" socialism; 18th century liberalism, anarchism, and pacifism.

The Relevance of Proudhon

NOTHING will seem more remarkable to future students of this decade than the heavy fatalism that has weighed over all political thinkers, from the philosopher and the statesman to the ordinary man ruminating over his newspaper. For one reason or another, we all seem to be accepting as inevitable the coming of increasingly totalitarian states, of new Leviathans. Totalitarianism on the Nazi model will, we believe, be destroyed, but in Germany as in the Catholic countries new presbyter may well be old priest writ large. Totalitarianism on the model of the Bolsheviki and Kuomintang will, we think, survive, and in the small nations there must be co-ordination and concentration of power. In the great democracies themselves the expectation is of increased State control, not only over finance, commerce and industry, but over education, health and leisure activities as well. No one seems to regard these tendencies with much enthusiasm, but everyone seems to think them inevitable. Many people are appalled by the prospect of the bureaucracy which must be entailed by bigger units, political, economic and social, but no one believes in an alternative. Somehow, we say, the civil liberties, the dignity of the individual, must be preserved in the new Leviathan, but how, we have no time to think. Perhaps, if the right people are in control, all will be well. Meanwhile there are more urgent matters on hand.

Liberalism, which might have been expected to give the world a lead in this matter, is on the defensive. Was it guilty of acquiescing in Privilege, in Unemployment? An uneasy conscience keeps its standards furled, or sends them out bearing a strange device (New Deal, Common Wealth) to join the Salvation Army procession towards State Socialism. Social Democracy, on the other hand, is nailed to its own mast. Its whole testament, from the gospels of Marx to the epistles of Lenin, insists on the extension of the power of the State. Not for nothing were the early Marxists called Authoritarians! not for nothing did the Webbs find their mecca in Moscow. All schools of Social Democracy from the Germans to the Fabians, have preached centralization. Now, according to their own inevitable logic of history, they are due to get it.

But is it inevitable? Is there no alternative to the totalitarian State under one guise or another? If socialists look back in the history of their own movement they will find one. They will find a tradition known variously as libertarianism, individualism, self-government, mutualism, federalism, syndicalism: a tradition usually described as Anarchism, which fought its first fight with Marxism nearly one hundred years ago, and its latest, but not its last, in 1936, behind the lines of Republican Spain. They will find that this Anarchist (no-ruler) tradition was stronger than that of Marx in the First International, which Marx disbanded—or removed to New York, it comes to the same thing—because so many of the delegates were Anarchists. They will find that their famous Paris Commune was the creation of men who called themselves mutualists or federalists and were no followers of Marx. They will find that the most radical section of the French working-class movement was composed of syndicalists who opposed socialism, both Marxist and parliamentary. They will find that the revolutionary workers who bore the heat and burden of the day in Switzerland, Italy, and Spain were Anarchists. And they may even find that the mass of the people of Russia in 1917 cast their vote against the Marxists and for the Social Revolutionaries who stood nearer to the Anarchist camp.

The father of this Anarchist tradition was Proudhon, who died in 1865, eighteen years before Marx. It was Proudhon's disciple Bakunin who led the majority in the First International; Proudhon's disciples—Beslay, Courbet and Gambier among them—who led the Paris Communards (the Manifesto of April 19th might have been drafted by Proudhon); Proudhon's follower, Sorel, whose teaching was responsible for the charter of the French C.G.T. adopted at Amiens in 1906. It was a book of Proudhon's that sowed the seeds of Anarchism in Catalonia and Andalusia, and Proudhon's ideas, transplanted indirectly, that took root among the Social Revolutionaries in Russia.

It may well be that when our generation recovers from its fatalism and is disenchanted of its Etatism, Proudhon will come into his own as a prophet. The whole stress of his teaching was on Justice, which he defined as "respect, spontaneously felt and reciprocally guaranteed, for *human dignity*, in whatever person and whatever circumstances it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finds itself manifested and at the cost of whatever risk its defense may expose us to." But this conception of Justice did not lead Proudhon into crude individualism. There is no dignity without liberty, no liberty without community, no community in a society of slaves, nor in a society divided into privileged and underprivileged, rulers and ruled. Society must be based on free association, of which marriage is the supreme institutional example. After the family comes the free union of co-operators, and after these mutualist units the federation. The movement must come from the bottom by contract, not from the top by decree. "I begin by *Anarchy*, the conclusion of my criticism of the idea of government, to end by *federation* as the necessary basis of European public law, and later on of the organization of all states. . . . No doubt we are far away from it, and it will take centuries to reach this ideal; but our *Law* is to advance in that direction." The great enemy was the appetite for power, which reaches its apotheosis in the centralised state. Writing before either the German Empire or the Italian Kingdom was cemented, Proudhon insisted on the necessity of "conserving European equilibrium by diminishing the Great Powers and multiplying the small, organizing the latter in federations for defence."

Few writers have been more vulgarly misunderstood than Proudhon. He is most generally known as the author of the slogan "Property is Theft"; it is forgotten that he adds "Property is Liberty." (The landowner's rent is theft; the peasant's proprietorship may mean liberty.) He is commonly believed to be a Utopian; it is forgotten that he was the most outspoken opponent of the Saint-Simonians, Fourierists and other French Utopians of his day. He is frequently held to have been a starry-eyed rhetorician; it is forgotten that he wrote of February 24, 1848: "The Revolution must be given a direction, and already I see it perishing in a flood of speeches"—and that he wrote this on February 25. He is thought of as a violent man; in fact, no more gentle creature ever used polemical language. He has been hailed alternatively as the Apostle of Counter-Revolution and as the Prophet of the Barricades.

Most of the misunderstanding of Proudhon can be traced back to Marx (who was jealous of him) and to one more respectable cause. Proudhon was both the progenitor and the critic of Socialism. He was attacking not only the very present enemy, Capitalism, but also its probable successor, State Socialism. Hence the apparent contradictions in his work. He was criticizing both the present and the future. This is what makes his teaching so valuable to us in 1944; but it needs careful reading to disentangle the tenses. Not that he is a difficult writer. Critics have hailed him as one of the greatest masters of French prose. Sainte-Beuve, his first biographer, praised his style and called attention to his strict etymological use of words and to his debt to the great Latin authors and to the Bible. He wrote a vigorous and lapidary prose, and it is not so much his language that is difficult but the construction of his books which are confusing in their lack of balance and constantly changing angle of attack. He thought of himself as a metaphysician and sometimes as an economist, whereas he was a moralist first and last. That makes him easy for the unsophisticated to read and for the sophisticated to refute. (For English readers, his work awaits a translator; there is only one book available in our language.)

Moralists are often immoral men, as physicians are often invalids, and this is no valid criticism of their work. But how inspiring to find a man whose life bears out his teaching! Proudhon's life ranks him among the rare saints of Socialism. He was born of working people, his father a brewery laborer in Besancon, his mother a servant doing heavy work in the brewery. Proudhon herded cattle on the foothills of the Jura for five years before being able, at the age of twelve, to go to school, where he was too poor to buy books and often had to go without cap or sabots. At nineteen he became a printer's apprentice, and as a printer he made his *tour de France*. Most of his learning he picked up in the Besancon library and in the printer's shop, where he mastered Hebrew and perfected his Latin while setting up an edition of the Bible. Circumstances made him a grammarian, and like Renan, he came to philosophy by way of philology, but the direction of his life's work was clear to him from the beginning.

Submitting an essay for a prize at Besancon Academy, he addressed the examiners as follows: "Born and bred in the working-class and belonging to it now and always in heart, spirit, habits and, above all, in common interest and aspiration, the candidate's greatest joy, if he were to secure your votes, would be . . . to be able in future to work unceasingly through philosophy and science with all the energy of his will and all the powers of his mind for the liberation of his brothers and companions."

Proudhon won the prize—1,500 francs—and went to Paris to begin his life of self-dedication. As he had promised, he worked unceasingly, and as he had half expected, his work brought him poverty, prison, exile, debts and, most dangerous of all, notoriety. None of these trials broke him; indeed, the alchemy of his character turned each to spiritual gold. Poverty, though it sometimes drove him to accept fantastic employment as ghost-writer for a literary lawyer or as clerk to a canal-boat company, usually kept him near to the people whom he had made his cure. Prison—the easy-going imprisonment of the Second Empire—gave him leisure to write his best books and to take what he always held to be his wisest action, his marriage to the Parisian working-girl who was to tend him so lovingly for the rest of his days. Exile—in Belgium, from 1858 to 1862—was a harder cross to bear, as it is for all Frenchmen. On the surface of his mind his greatest worries were now about his debts. He was a continual but scrupulous borrower, one of the few who never lost a friend through owing him—or repaying him—money. His gift for friendship was equalled only by his gift for domestic life. Not all his tribulations, not even that of chronic ill-health brought on by overwork, prevented him from being a model husband and father. Indeed, this notorious revolutionary was a model of what have been called the bourgeois virtues. When he returned to Paris in the autumn of 1863 he was broken in

P. J. PROUDHON

General Idea of the

REVOLUTION IN THE 19TH CENTURY

This is the only major work of Proudhon now available in English. It contains chapters on "The Principle of Association," "The Principle of Authority," "The Absorption of Government by the Economic Organism" and other important themes. We have secured a number of copies direct from the publisher in London. (Translated by John Beverley Robinson. Paper cover.)

304 pages *$1.50 postpaid*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

health but intact in spirit. Perhaps he should be excused one senile lapse into optimism when, a few months after seeing his book, *The Federative Principle*, through the press and a few months before his death, he was approached by sixty working men who had issued a manifesto demanding representation in Parliament, he wrote, *"La Revolution sociale marche bien plus vite qu'il ne semble."*

Such was the life of the man who was the champion of Self-Government against Etatism, or, as he would have put it, of Anarchy against Panarchy. Sooner or later there will be a reaction against the centralizing tendency which has characterized the political thought and action of our generation, particularly since the world economic crisis. The reaction may well be preluded by a revival of interest in Proudhon.

J. HAMPDEN JACKSON

Excerpts from "The General Idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century"

I BEG that the reader will pardon me, if in the course of this study an expression should escape me which might betray any feeling of self-esteem. I have the double regret, in this great question of authority, of being, on the one hand as yet alone in asserting the Revolution categorically; on the other, in having perverse ideas attributed to me, which I, more than anybody, abhor. It is not my fault if, in supporting so lofty a thesis, I seem to plead my own personal cause. At least I shall do so, even if I may not defend myself with some vivacity, that the intelligence of the reader may lose nothing. Moreover our mind is so constructed that it sees the light never better than when it springs from the clash of opposing ideas. Man, says Hobbes, is a fighting animal. It was God himself who, when placing us in this world, gave us this precept: *Increase, multiply, labor and fight.*

Some twelve years ago, well I may recall it, while busying myself with researches into the foundations of society, having in view not at all political eventualities, impossible then to have foreseen, but solely for the greater glory of philosophy, I was the first to put into circulation an idea which has since obtained great renown, the denial of Government and of Property. Others before myself, to seem original, humorous, or seeking a paradox, had denied those two principles; but no one had made this denial the subject of a serious, earnest criticism. One of our most good-natured journalists, M. Pelletan, undertaking my defence one day, *motu proprio*, made this singular statement to his readers, that, in attacking sometimes property, sometimes power, sometimes something else, I was firing a gun into the air, to attract toward myself the attention of empty-heads. M. Pelletan was too good indeed, and I cannot be too much obliged to him for his kindness: he must have taken me for a literary person.

It is time that the public should know that, in philosophy, in politics, in theology, in history, negation is the preliminary requirement to affirmation. All progress begins by abolishing something; every reform rests upon denunciation of some abuse; each new idea is based upon the proved insufficiency of the old idea. Thus Christianity, in denying the plurality of gods, in becoming atheistic, from the pagan point of view, asserted the unity of God, and from this unity deduced its whole theology. Thus Luther, in denying the authority of the Church, asserted the authority of reason, and laid the first stone of modern philosophy. Thus our fathers, the revolutionaries of '89 in denying the sufficiency of feudal rule, asserted, without understanding it, the necessity of some different system, which it is the mission of our age to explain. Thus, finally, I myself, having demonstrated afresh, under the eyes of my readers, the illegitimacy and powerlessness of government as a principle of order, will cause to arise from this negation a productive, affirmative idea, which must lead to a new form of civilization.

. . . . . .

I shall be brief. I know that volumes would be needed to explain so grave a question, with due form and including all useful implications. But the mind of the people is quick in our time: they understand everything, guess everything, know everything. Their daily experience, their intuitive spontaneity, take the place of dialectic and erudition: they can grasp in a few pages, what, not more than four years ago, would have demanded a folio from the professional publicists.

Government as Father

The form under which men first conceived of Order in Society is the patriarchal or hierarchical; that is to say, in principle, Authority; in action, Government. Justice, which afterwards was divided into distributive and commutative justice, appeared at first under the former heading only: a *SUPERIOR* granting to *Inferiors* what is coming to each one.

The governmental idea sprang from family customs and domestic experience: no protest arose then: Government seemed as natural to Society as the subordination of children to their father. That is why M. de Bonald was able to say, and rightly, that the family is the embryo of the State, of which it reproduces the essential classes: the king in the father, the minister in the mother, the subject in the child. That is also the reason that all the fraternity socialists, who take the family as the rudiments of Society, arrive at a dictatorship, which is the most exaggerated form of government. The administration of M. Cabet in his estate of Nauvoo is a good example. How much longer will it take us to understand this connection of ideas?

The primitive conception of order through Government is found among all peoples; and if, from the very beginning, the efforts that were made to organize, modify and limit the action of Power, to devote it to general needs and to special circumstances, show that the denial of government was implied in its affirmation, it is certain that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no rival hypothesis arose; the spirit always remained the same. As the nations emerged from a state of savagery and barbarism, they are observed to have immediately entered upon the governmental path, and to traverse a circle of institutions which are always the same, and which historians and publicists arrange in classes succeeding one another, Monarchy, Aristocracy, Democracy.

But there is something more serious.

The prejudice in favor of government having sunk into our deepest consciousness, stamping even reason in its mould, every other conception has been for a long time rendered impossible, and the boldest thinkers could but say that Government was no doubt a scourge, a chastisement for humanity, but that it was a necessary evil!

That is why, up to our own days, the most emancipating revolutions and all the eruptions of liberty have always ended in a reiteration of faith in and submission to power; why all revolutions have served only to re-establish tyranny: I make no exception of the Constitution of '93, any more than of that of 1848, the two most advanced expressions nevertheless of French democracy.

What has maintained this mental predisposition and made its fascination invincible for so long a time, is that, through the supposed analogy between Society and the family, the Government has always presented itself to the mind as the natural organ of justice, the protector of the weak, the preserver of the peace. By the attribution to it of provident care and of full guaranty, the Government took root in the hearts, as well as in the minds of men; it formed a part of the universal soul, it was the faith, the intimate, invincible superstition of the citizens! If this confidence weakened, they said of Government, as they said of Religion and Property, it is not the institution which is bad, but the abuse of it; it is not the king who is wicked but his ministers; Ah, if the king knew!

Thus to the hierarchical and absolutist view of a governing authority, is added an ideal which appeals to the soul, and conspires incessantly against the desire for equality and independence. The people at each revolution think to reform the faults of their government according to the inspiration of their hearts; but they are deceived by their own ideas. While they think that they will secure Power in their own interest, they really have it always against them: in place of a protector, they give themselves a tyrant.

Experience, in fact, shows that everywhere and always the Government, however much it may have been for the people at its origin, has placed itself on the side of the richest and most educated class against the more numerous and poorer class; it has little by little become narrow and exclusive; and instead of maintaining liberty and equality among all, it works persistently to destroy them, by virtue of its natural inclination towards privilege.

We have shown in a previous study how since 1789, the revolution having founded nothing, society, as M. Collard expressed it, having been reduced to dust, the distribution of wealth left to chance, the Government, whose task it is to protect property as well as person, found itself in fact established for the rich against the poor. Who does not see now that this anomaly, which then it was thought proper to embody in the political constitution of our country, is common to all governments? At no epoch is property found to depend on labor exclusively: at no epoch has work been guaranteed by the equilibrium of economic forces: in this matter, the civilization of the nineteenth century is not any more advanced than that of the Middle Ages. Authority, in defending rights, however established, in protecting interests, however acquired, has always been for riches against misfortune: the history of governments is the martyrology of the proletariat.

. . . . . .

What is the "Social Contract"?

We must get out of this vicious circle. The political idea, the ancient notion of distributive justice, must be contradicted through and through; and that of commutative justice must be reached, which, in the logic of history as well as of law, succeeds it. Blind men by choice, seeking in the clouds for what is under your nose, read again your authors, look about you, analyze your own formulas, and you will find the solution, which has dragged from immemorial time through the centuries, and which neither you nor any one of your satellites have deigned to notice.

. . . . . .

What really is the *Social Contract?* An agreement of the citizen with the government? No, that would mean but the continuation of the same idea. The social contract is an agreement of man with man; an agreement from which must result what we call society. In this, the notion of *commutative justice,* first brought forward by the primitive fact of exchange, and defined by the Roman law, is substituted for that of *distributive justice,* dismissed without appeal by republican criticism. Translate these words, *contract, commutative justice,* which are the language of the law, into the language of business, and you have *Commerce,* that is to say, in its highest significance, the act by which man and man declare themselves essentially producers, and abdicate all pretensions to govern each other.

Commutative justice, the *reign of contract,* the *industrial* or *economic system,* such are the different synonyms for the idea which by its accession must do away with the old systems of *distributive justice,* the *reign of law,* or in more concrete terms, *feudal, governmental* or *military* rule. The future hope of humanity lies in this substitution.

But before this revolution of doctrine can be formulated, before it can be comprehended, before it can take possession of the peoples who alone can put it into practice, what fruitless debates! what weary inactivity of ideas! what a time for agitators and sophists! From the controversy of Jurieu with Bossuet, to the publication of Rousseau's *Social Contract* almost a century elapsed; and when the latter appeared, it was not to assert the idea, but to stifle it.

Rousseau, whose authority has ruled us for almost a century, understood nothing of the social contract. To him, most of all, must be ascribed the great relapse of '93, expiated already by fifty-seven years of fruitless disorder, and which certain minds more ardent than wise wish us still to regard as a sacred tradition.

The idea of contract excludes that of government: M. Ledru-Rollin, who is a lawyer, and whose attention I call to this point, ought to know it. What characterizes the contract is the agreement for equal exchange; and it is by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

virtue of this agreement that liberty and well-being increase; while by the establishment of authority, both of these necessarily diminish. This will be evident if we reflect that contract is the act whereby two or several individuals agree to organize among themselves, for a definite purpose and time, that industrial power which we have called *exchange;* and in consequence have obligated themselves to each other, and reciprocally guaranteed a certain amount of services, products, advantages, duties, &c., which they are in a position to obtain and give to each other; recognizing that they are otherwise perfectly independent, whether for consumption or production.

Between contracting parties there is necessarily for each one a real personal interest; it implies that a man bargains with the aim of securing his liberty and his revenue at the same time, without any possible loss. Between governing and governed, on the contrary, no matter how the system of representation or of delegation of the governmental function is arranged, there is *necessarily* alienation of a part of the liberty and of the means of the citizen; in return for what advantage we have explained above.

The contract therefore is essentially reciprocal: it imposes no obligation upon the parties, except that which results from their personal promise of reciprocal delivery: it is not subject to any external authority: it alone forms the law between the parties: it awaits their initiative for its execution.

But if such is the contract in its most general acceptation, and in daily practice; what will be the Social Contract, which is relied upon to bind together all the members of a nation into one and the same interest?

The Social Contract is the supreme act by which each citizen pledges to the association his love, his intelligence, his work, his services, his goods, in return for the affection, ideas, labor, products, services and goods of his fellows; the measure of the right of each being determined by the importance of his contributions, and the recovery that can be demanded in proportion to his deliveries.

. . . . . .

The Rousseauian Perversion

Such should be the social contract, according to the definitions of the law and universal practice. Is it necessary now to say that, out of the multitude of relations which the social pact is called upon to define and regulate, Rousseau saw only the political relations; that is to say, he suppressed the fundamental points of the contract, and dwelt only upon those that are secondary? Is it necessary to say that Rosseau understood and respected not one of these essential, indispensable conditions, — the absolute liberty of the party, his personal direct part, his signature given with full understanding, and the share of liberty and prosperity which he should experience?

For him, the social contract is neither an act of reciprocity, nor an act of association. Rousseau takes care not to enter into such considerations. It is an act of appointment of arbiters, chosen by the citizens, without any preliminary agreement, for all cases of contest, quarrel, fraud or violence, which can happen in the relations which they may subsequently form among themselves, the said arbiters being clothed with sufficient force to put their decisions into execution, and to collect their salaries.

Of a real, true contract, on whatsoever subject, there is no vestige in Rousseau's book. To give an exact idea of his theory, I cannot do better than compare it with a commercial agreement, in which the names of the parties, the nature and value of the goods, products and services involved, the conditions of quality, delivery, price, reimbursement, everything in fact which constitutes the material of contracts, is omitted, and nothing is mentioned but penalties and jurisdictions.

Indeed, Citizen of Geneva, you talk well. But before holding forth about the sovereign and the prince, about the policeman and the judge, tell me first what is my share of the bargain? What? You expect me to sign an agreement in virtue of which I may be prosecuted for a thousand transgressions, by municipal, rural, river and forest police, handed over to tribunals, judged, condemned for damage, cheating, swindling, theft, bankruptcy, robbery, disobedience to the laws of the State, offence to public morals, vagabondage, — and in this agreement I find not a word of either my rights or my obligations, I find only penalties!

But every penalty no doubt presupposes a duty, and every duty corresponds to a right. Where then in your agreement are my rights and my duties? What have I promised to my fellow citizens? What have they promised to me? Show it to me, for without that, your penalties are but excesses of power, your law-controlled State a flagrant usurpation, your police, your judgment and your executions so many abuses. You who have so well denied property, who have impeached so eloquently the inequality of conditions among men, what dignity, what heritage, have you for me in your republic, that you should claim the right to judge me, to imprison me, to take my life and honor? Perfidious declaimer, have you inveighed so loudly against exploiters and tyrants, only to deliver me to them without defence?

Rousseau defined the social contract thus:

"To find a form of association which defends and protects, with the whole power of the community, the person and goods of each associate; and by which each one, uniting himself to all, obeys only himself and remains as free as before."

Yes, these are indeed the conditions of the social pact, as far as concerns *the protection and defence of goods and persons.* But as for the mode of acquisition and transmission, as to labor, exchange, value and price of products, as to education, as to the multitude of relations which, whether he wishes it or not, places man in perpetual association with his fellows, Rousseau says not a word; his theory is perfectly meaningless. Who does not see that without some definition of rights and duties, the sanction which follows is absolutely null; who does not see that where there are no stipulations, there can be no infractions, nor, in consequence, any criminals; and, to conclude with philosophical rigor, that a society which after having provoked revolt, punishes and kills by virtue of such authority, itself commits assassination with premeditation and by treachery.

Rousseau is so far from desiring that any mention should be made in the social contract of the principles and laws which rule the fortunes of nations and of individuals, that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his demagogue's programme, as well as in his Treatise on Education, he starts with the false, thievish, murderous supposition that only the individual is good, that society depraves him, that man therefore should refrain as much as possible from all relations with his fellows; and that all we have to do in this world below, while remaining in complete isolation, is to form among ourselves a mutual insurance society, for the protection of our persons and property; that all the rest, that is to say, economic matters, really the only matters of importance, should be left to the chance of birth or speculation, and submitted, in case of litigation, to the arbitration of elected officers, who should determine according to rules laid down by themselves, or by the light of natural equity. In a word, the social contract, according to Rousseau, is nothing but the offensive and defensive alliance of those who possess, against those who do not possess; and the only part played by the citizen is to pay the police, for which he is assessed in proportion to his fortune, and the risk to which he is exposed from general pauperism.

It is this contract of hatred, this monument of incurable misanthropy, this coalition of the barons of property, commerce and industry against the disinherited lower class, this oath of social war indeed, which Rousseau calls *Social Contract,* with a presumption which I should call that of a scoundrel, if I believed in the genius of the man.

But if the *virtuous and sensitive* Jean-Jacques had taken for his aim the perpetuation of discord among men, could he have done better than to offer them, as their contract of union, this charter of their eternal antagonism? Watch him at work: you will find in his theory of government the same spirit that inspired his theory of education. As the tutor, so the statesman. The pedagogue preaches isolation, the publicist sows dissension.

After having laid down as a principle that the people are the only sovereign, that they can be represented only by themselves, that the law should be the expression of the will of all, and other magnificent commonplaces, after the way of demagogues Rousseau quietly abandons and discards this principle. In the first place, he substitutes the will of the majority for the general, collective, indivisible will; then, under pretext that it is not possible for a whole nation to be occupied from morning till night with public affairs, he gets back, by the way of elections, to the nomination of representatives or proxies, who shall do the law-making in the name of the people, and whose decrees shall have the force of laws. Instead of a direct, personal transaction where his interests are involved, the citizen has nothing left but the power of choosing his rulers by a plurality vote. That done, Rousseau rests easy. Tyranny, claiming divine right, had become odious; he reorganizes it and makes it respectable, by making it proceed from the people, so he says. Instead of a universal, complete agreement, which would assure the rights of all, provide for the needs of all, and guard against all difficulties, which all must understand, consent to and sign, he gives us, what? That which today we call *direct government,* a recipe by which, even in the absence of all royalty, aristocracy, priesthood, the abstract *collectivity* of the people can still be used for maintaining the parasitism of the minority and the oppression of the greater number. It is, in a word, the legalization of social chaos by a clever fraud, the consecration of poverty, based on the sovereignty of the people. Moreover there is not a word about labor, nor property, nor the industrial forces; all of which it is the very object of a Social Contract to organize. Rousseau does not know what economics means. His programme speaks of political rights only; it does not mention economic rights.

. . . . . .

It appears to be the privilege of literary people that style should take the place of reason and morality.

Never man united to such an extent intellectual pride, aridity of soul, lowness of tastes, depravity of habits, ingratitude of heart; never did the warmth of eloquence, the pretence of sensitiveness, the effrontery of paradox, arouse to such infatuation. Since the time of Rousseau, and following his example, there has been founded among us a sentimental and philanthrophic school, I should say, industry, which is able to gather in the honor due to charity and devotion, while really practising the most complete selfishness. Distrust this philosophy, this politics, this socialism of Rousseau. His philosophy is all phrases and covers only emptiness, his politics is full of domination; as for his ideas about society, they scarcely conceal their profound hypocrisy. They who read Rousseau and admire him, are simply dupes, and I pardon them: as for those who follow and copy him, I warn them to look to their own reputation. The time is not far away when a quotation from Rousseau will suffice to cast suspicion upon a writer.

. . . . . .

Thus, while the revolutionary tradition of the sixteenth century gave us the idea of the Social Contract as an antithesis to that of Government, an idea which the Gallic genius, so judicial in its character, had not failed to penetrate; the tricks of a rhetorician sufficed to divert us from the true road, and to cause delay in the interpretation of it. The negation of government, which is at the foundation of the Utopia of Morelly, which cast a gleam, soon extinguished, over the sinister manifestations of the *Enragés* and *Hébertists,* and which would have emerged from the doctrines of Baboeuf if Baboeuf had known how to reason and deduce his own principles: — this great and decisive negation remained not understood all through the eighteenth century.

Saint-Simon's "Industrial Government"

But an idea cannot perish. It is born again always from its contradictory. Let Rousseau triumph: his glory of a moment will be but the more detested. While waiting for the theoretical and practical deduction of the Contractual Idea, complete trial of the principle of authority will serve for the education of Humanity. From the fulness of this political evolution will finally arise the opposite hypothesis: Government, exhausting itself, will give birth to Socialism as its historic sequel.

It was Saint Simon who first took up the thread again, in timid language, and with a still dim consciousness.

"The human race," he wrote in the year 1818, "has been called upon to live at first under governmental and feudal rule. It is destined to pass from the *governmental* or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

military rule to *administrative* or *industrial* rule, after it has made sufficient progress in the physical sciences and in industry.

"Finally, it has been subjected through its organization to endure a long and violent crisis in its passage from a military to a pacific system.

"The present period is one of transition.

"The transitional crisis began by the preaching of Luther; since that time the tendency of thought has been fundamentally critical and revolutionary."

Saint Simon then cites in support of his ideas, as having had a more or less vague apprehension of this great metamorphosis, among statesmen, Sully, Colbert, Turgot, Necker, even Villèle; among philosophers, Bacon, Montesquieu, Condorcet, A. Comte, B. Constant, Cousin, A. de Laborde, Fièvée, Dunoyer, &c.

All Saint Simon is in these few lines, written in the style of the prophets; but too hard of assimilation for the age when they were written, and too condensed in meaning for the youthful spirits who first attached themselves to the noble innovator. Note well, that therein is found neither community of goods nor of women, nor purification of the flesh, nor androgyny, nor a Supreme Father, nor *Circulus,* nor Triad. Nothing of all that has been disseminated by his disciples really belongs to the master; on the contrary, the disciples have quite misunderstood the meaning of Saint Simon.

What did Saint Simon mean?

From the moment when, on the one hand, philosophy succeeds to faith, and replaces the ancient conception of government by that of contract; or, on the other, when after a Revolution which has abolished feudalism, society requires the development and harmonization of its economic powers; from this moment it becomes inevitable that government, already denied in theory, should fall to pieces in practice. And when Saint Simon, to designate this new order of things, conforms to the old style and uses the word government, joined with the epithet *administrative* or *industrial,* it is evident that this word, from his pen, acquires a metaphorical, or rather analogical, meaning, which could not but mislead the uninitiated. How is it possible to misunderstand the thought of Saint Simon, in reading the still more explicit passage which I here cite:

"If we observe the course which is followed in the education of individuals, we notice that in the primary schools government has the most importance; and in schools of a higher grade, the government of the children continually diminishes in intensity, while instruction plays a more important part. *It has been the same in the education of society.* Military activity, that is to say, feudal or governmental, had to be strongest at the origin of society; it always had to diminish, while administrative activity had to acquire greater importance; and the administrative power must end by entirely overshadowing military power."

To these extracts from Saint Simon must be added his famous *Parable,* which in 1819 fell like an axe upon the official world; and for which the author was tried in the Court of Assizes, on the 20th of February, 1820, and acquitted. The length of this work, which is moreover well known, forbids us from quoting it here.

Saint Simon's negation of government, as is easily seen, is not deduced from the idea of contract, which for eighty years Rousseau and his votaries had corrupted and dishonored. It flows out of a different kind of insight, entirely experimental and *a posteriori,* such as is suited to an observer of facts. The end of governments, which the providentially inspired theory of contract had, since the time of Jurieu, foreshadowed in the future of society, Saint Simon establishes from the law of the evolution of humanity, appearing at his strongest in the heat of discussion. Thus the theory of the Law and the philosophy of history, like two surveyor's poles planted one in front of the other, direct the mind toward an unknown revolution; one step more and we shall reach the issue.

All roads lead to Rome, says the proverb. All investigations also conduct to the truth.

I think that I have over-abundantly established that the eighteenth century would have reached the negation of government by the development of the idea of contract, that is to say, by the judicial road, if it had not been turned from the path by the classic, retrospective and declamatory republicanism of Rousseau.

This negation of government Saint Simon deduced from observation of history, and of the progress of humanity.

"An Idea Cannot Perish"

In my turn I have completed the analysis of economic functions, and of the theory of credit and exchange, if I may speak of myself at this time, when I alone represent the revolutionary point of view. To establish this discovery, I have no need, I fancy, to mention the different works and articles in which it is recorded: they have obtained enough notoriety in the past three years.

Thus the Idea, the incorruptible seed, passes along the ages, illuminating from time to time a man of willing mind, to the day when an intellect that nothing can intimidate receives it, broods upon it, then hurls it like a meteor among the astonished crowds.

The idea of contract, in opposition to that of government, which was the outcome of the Reformation, passed through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, without being noticed by a single publicist, nor observed by a single revolutionary. On the other hand, all that was most illustrious in the Church, in philosophy, in politics, conspired to oppose it. Rousseau, Sièyés, Robespierre, M. Guizot, all that school of parliamentarians, bore the banner of the opposition. At last one man, perceiving the disregard of the leading principle, brought again to the light the new and fruitful idea: unfortunately the practical side of his doctrines deceived his own disciples: they could not see that the producer is the negation of the ruler, that organization is incompatible with authority; and thus for thirty years the principle was lost to sight. Finally, it took hold of public opinion, through the loudness of protest; but then, *O vanas hominum mentes, o pectora coeca!* (Oh, dim minds! Oh, dull hearts of men!) opposition brings about revolution! The idea of Anarchy had hardly been implanted in the mind of the people when it found so-called gardeners who watered it with their calumnies, fertilized it with their misrepresentations, warmed it in the hothouse of their hatred, supported it by their stupid opposition. Today, thanks to them, it has borne the anti-gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernmental idea, the idea of Labor, the idea of Contract, which is growing, mounting, seizing with its tendrils the workingmen's societies and soon, like the grain of mustard seed of the Gospel, it will form a great tree, with branches which cover the earth.

The sovereignty of Reason having been substituted for that of Revolution,

The notion of Contract succeeding that of Government,

Historic evolution leading Humanity inevitably to a new system,

Economic criticism having shown that political institutions must be lost in industrial organization,

We may conclude without fear that the revolutionary formula cannot be *Direct Legislation*, nor *Direct Government*, nor *Simplified Government*, that it is NO GOVERNMENT.

Neither monarchy, nor aristocracy, nor even democracy itself, in so far as it may imply any government at all, even though acting in the name of the people, and calling itself the people. No authority, no government, not even popular, that is the Revolution.

P. J. PROUDHON

500 Red Army Men

Note: The following letter was written home by an American sergeant who helped run a small camp in Belgium where groups of Russsian "Displaced Persons" and of German war prisoners ("pow's") were successively quartered. His close observation of the Russians—about 500 *of them passed through his camp—gives one an intimate sense of the kind of human beings the Soviet Union is turning out today. It also gives one a decidedly "unofficial" view of the Germans. The letter is printed with the writer's permission.*

Most of these Russians were of army age, that is, my age, on an average, and as such they were either extremely young, or born after the revolution of 1917, and we can truthfully say that they represented the product of that revolution. We can judge the value of that revolution by what it has done for the individual, the small man, the unit that makes up the mass. When interviewing these Russians to find out their job qualifications I was greatly impressed by the amount of technical knowledge possessed by most of the men. The list would read: "railroad technician, diesel technician, dynamo technician, locomotive technician, diesel motor mechanic, tool-maker technician, etc." It read on paper as if the five year plan had really laid a remarkable groundwork. I thought, well, all these guys (Paul included) were dead wrong when they debunked the Russian regime because it has obviously educated its common man far and beyond anything even heard of in the U. S.

However, I wanted to verify their educational status for myself. I don't know a great deal about Russian literature but I know what everyone else knows, and that is the names of Dostoievsky, Gorki, Tolstoi, Gogol, Pushkin & Chekov, and in the field of music I know the Russian composers, likewise in the field of ballet I know the Russians who did the scenery, the music, the choreography, and finally, I know of a few of their painters. I started with the ones who looked more intelligent than the rest and would ask them through Boris about what they had read, about their great heritage in literature, music, poetry and ballet. Out of the entire group, I doubt if there were more than 5 who had even heard the names of these various authors, writers or painters. Culture, per se, evidently did not exist for them. Well, I reasoned, in a society that is bent on improving its technical facilities and standard of living, culture as such probably comes later, further down the list; the stomach and genitals are really more important than the fine arts. I laid it aside, though I still couldn't get over the surprise. Incidentally, the one's who had heard about their own cultural achievements didn't have even an ABC of foreign literature: Shelley, G. B. Shaw, Goethe, Schiller just did not register at all. It was disturbing to me that a man who could be a "tool-maker technician" should know nothing outside of his own trade, for the trade of tool-making takes an extensive knowledge of mathematics, mechanics, and some physics, metallurgy and probably a few more things that I know nothing about, and I wondered how a man could absorb higher mathematics, mechanics, design, metallurgy and so forth and still not have the slightest inkling of such a name as Dosteievsky or Pushkin. It didn't make sense!

There were other things that puzzled me. One was their tremendous delight over getting white bread with their meals. It was amazing the amount of fuss they made over it. I asked Boris about it one day and he said they thought it was cake. Then there was the fuss they made over the plain castile soap, as if it were the sweetest thing in the world. And the way they cooked their foods: every meal they took all the ingredients and made a stew out of them. And we could never give them enough lard—everything was cooked or fried in lard till it all came out one greasy, soupy stew. Also there was the first time we got PX rations for them. They nearly fell over when they got 7 packs of cigarettes, 6 bars of candy, a package of gum, 3 razor blades, a bar of soap, a comb, 2 boxes of matches and some other small odds and ends. The expresssions of wonder and delight, the amount of jealousy if one guy got an extra Camel—it just didn't stack up. It certainly proved one thing: the Russian economy was no luxury-providing economy. Still, I rationalized it away, thinking that Russsia had enough to do to educate a post-revolutionary generation, expand industrially, and fight two wars, etc. without worrying about white bread and candy.

But pretty soon I got suspicious even about our Russians' technical knowledge. I first began to wonder when we needed some men to drive a dozen trucks on a job and it turned out that, in the whole 125 men of the first group, only three could drive a car. This certainly made little sense considering all the technical training they were supposed to have. Even some of those who had listed themselves as "auto mechanics" couldn't drive a car. When I inquired into this, I found that the auto mechanics who couldn't drive were body-and-fender men, automotive arc-welders, etc., and not mechanics in our general sense of the term at all. This novel break-down of auto mechanics into many detail specialists, each of whom knew nothing about an automobile as a whole, rather intrigued me, and I decided to look into another such vocational group. I noticed there was an extraordinary number of "locomotive technicians," so I decided to investigate and find out just what a "locomotive technician" consisted of, what he knew in his own line, and whether his technical training was well carried out in his educational process. One after the other I sought them out and questioned them about locomotives. (I know very little about locomotives myself, but I've ridden on top of enough of them to know a little something about them.) It soon became apparent that these alleged "locomotive-technicians" hardly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knew anything about a locomotive, generally speaking, but that each one knew some part of a locomotive extremely well. Let's say we had a wheel specialist, or a boiler specialist, a braking mechanism specialist, a rail specialist, a gauge specialist, etc., but any one of these men taken aside to look at a locomotive that was out of repair could probably not do a damn thing for that locomotive unless it happened to be broken along the lines of his own specialty. For any other phase of locomotive work his ignorance is just as abysmal as it was about Pushkin. Chances are that he didn't know that a locomotive even had a piston if he were a frame-builder. I verified this fact several times over that a man was a technician in a sense of the word, but that actually he only knew one small phase of one operation of a mechanism (and this he knew inside out) but not a solitary thing else about the rest of the same operation. It began to dawn on me that the five year plans must have had huge educational projects that were exactly geared to mass production. It seemed to indicate a great restriction on the individual. Like controlling a man's environment so that he only recognizes one shade of blue and everything else just has no meaning for him. The fact that the Russian was thusly educated seemed to imply a much tighter-knit system than the Germans had over their Hitler Jugend and similar organizations.

This form of education was proved to me conclusively in the following manner. Before our company had moved up to Namur to take over the job of administration, these Russians had been there three weeks or so. They all slept in one room, ate in one room, and used a trench latrine that had been dug in the ground, had a washroom that had water and no sinks, so they used large tin cans for wash bowls. After the rest of the company got up to Namur (an advance detachment of a few men had gone ahead first) *we* arranged to have a latrine repaired that was 20 feet from the trench latrine. That was the only improvement that was made by the Russians. We, that is the company, were kept very busy repairing our own orderly room and doing the administrative work and as a result didn't have a great deal of time to think up improvements for the conditions of the Russians. Their conditions were livable, I don't mean to imply to the contrary, but they had only the barest necessities and it never occurred to the Russians that there could be anything else.

Well, eventually we lost the Russians and got German pows in return for them. The first thing that they did was on their free time to carve toilet seats. Next they asked for writing materials (the Russians never wrote to anyone and an approximate 40% were illiterate) so we arranged to get a mail system working for them. The next things the Germans asked for was reading material of any kind (the Russians never read anything, not a single one had a book with them whereas the Germans had several books with them, but the Russians never bothered to ask for any reading material for that matter). Well, we couldn't get them any reading material, but at least they had asked. The next thing they did was to take the washroom downstairs and rebuild it with whatever they could find. (There was a washroom on the third floor with sinks but no water, and in the basement there was water but no sinks: the relation between these two phenomena never occurred to the Russians but the Germans saw it immediately). They built an excellent washroom with sinks all around the walls out of that dingy room. Next they set about building tables so they could write, and little cabinets wherein they could keep clothes. They approached me for paint so that they could draw murals on the walls of their dining room. They asked to expand their quarters so that one room could be set aside as a recreation chamber, which we arranged and we went out and stole a piano to put in it. They made some wonderful paintings on the walls with some water colors I bought for them (naturally we couldn't get anything for them through regular supply channels since they were pows). As evidence, you can judge by the full length painting I sent to you which was done by one of their muralists in appreciation for the paints I bought for them with my own money. They set up a volley-ball court for themselves, put sinks in the kitchen in order to wash their pots and pans better, and put signs about cleanliness all over the place; eventually out of old pipes and so forth they even built a shower bath in one corner of their washroom, then built a laundry for clothes, complete with boiler for boiling the gasoline and oil out of their overalls, they have done a great many more things, none of which even occurred to the Russians' mind.

One day a prisoner came in to see me with a special request. He told me he used to be an organist, and wondered if the church next door had an organ and, if it did, could I ask the captain for permission for him to play on it in his spare time. The captain said OK but the organ was in pretty bad shape due to bombings, and when I relayed this to the pow, he volunteered to fix it. I got him some tools and some glue and in three days we could hear Bach fugues coming out of the church. On Easter, he played parts of *Parsifal* for his fellow pow's.

Now some of the above contrast may be due to "national character", but I don't think most of it. And if it is objected that perhaps the sample of Russians happened to be especially ignorant, and the Germans especially bright, I would say (1) the Russians came from the most industrialized and advanced part of Russia—Moscow, Kiev, Leningrad, the Urals—and included no Mongols or Siberians; and (2) high-ranking Russian officers frequently inspected our camp to make sure we were treating the men all right, yet even these presumably better-educated Russsians made no suggestions about a single one of the many improvements which the rank-and-file German pow's carried out on their own hook. I would also add that the more intelligent Russians I ran across had no desire to go back home. This was particularly true of those who had fought as partisans, who tended to be especially smart. On the other hand, some of the Russians were so politically naive that they were apparently content to fight on whichever side fed them, making absolutely no ideological distinctions between sides.

To sum up: as long as the Russian was eating and sleeping, regardless of how sloppy his conditions might have been, that's as far as his mind traveled. The latest thing the Germans did was to ask permission to put on some form of theatrical play to which we assented, and I went to see it and it was well done. (All this stuff is in the Geneva Convention, incidentally, we aren't "coddling" these guys because in addition they work like horses every day, all this stuff they do in their "free time".) Now then, without any further material, one can draw a great difference between the Russian and German regimes on a comparative basis of what those regimes did to the individual. Now, assuming, as we have been the entire length of the war, that *German fascism is a thing to be avoided and fought against*, and considering the above evidence which is only partially given at that, what do you think the Russian form of government must be?

THE RIGHT MAN IN THE RIGHT PLACE

Frankfurt-on-Main, May 26: Gen. Eisenhower opened his new headquarters here today in the huge sprawling 7-story I. G. Farben building.

—"The Stars & Stripes", May 27.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Popular Culture

Are Hospitals Made for People or Vice Versa?

A SHORT time ago I spent three weeks in one of the biggest and most modern hospitals in New York, first as a private patient and later in a semi-private room. After reading Paul Goodman's "Notes On Neo-Functionalism" (POLITICS, December, 1944), I began to think about Neo-Functionalism and also Functionalism in hospitals. Goodman states:

> "Functionalism is design of the means simply for the end. . . . The neo-functionalist goes further and reciprocally criticizes the end in terms of its producing means: Is the use, he asks, as simple or ingenious or clear as the efficient means that have produced it? He insists on a much closer scrutiny of the utility of the ends than does the functionalist; he keeps his eye more immediately on the object itself, and asks, is it worthwhile? . . .
>
> "For the means also consume one's time of life, and the end of life is to live well also during that time. Any end is *prima facie* suspicious if its means too do not give satisfaction."

I concluded that this statement had certain very evident applications to the modern hospital. Is the hospital functional: are its equipment and organization (the means) best suited to cure the patients (the ends)? And more important, is the hospital neo-functional: do the means "give satisfaction" while consuming "one's time of life"; Are they *in themselves* leading to the end (health) or is there a forgetfulness of ends in means?

No Functionalism

Let us begin by observing the lack of functionalism, which was not confined to the nurses' uniforms (Goodman's "frilly aprons and bonnets"). This particular hospital was functionally deficient (1) in the rooms and their equipment, (2) in the organization of the hospital work.

(1.)

In both rooms (private and semi-private), the bedside table was equipped with a water pitcher so heavy that after child-birth I could not pick it up alone. The bed light in both rooms was glary, in semi-private it was almost impossible to arrange it so as to avoid sitting in one's own light. In the private room, the telephone bell for my room and the next room were indistinguishable so that I had to answer my neighbor's calls and my own. In both rooms the windows were so heavy and unwieldy that it was usually necessary to call in a man to open them (the sills were so low that if a patient had been dizzy and the window open he would have fallen out—I heard of one instance when this occurred). In the private room, the bed light was placed so that the nurse had to walk around the bed to turn it off, wasting both her time and patience. The bed was in a draught, but was not placed so that a magnificent view of the river could be seen.

(2.)

I noticed poor functionalism in the disposition of equipment. Thus in the semi-private room the four patients were very cold and not given enough blankets. The blanket supply was kept four flights away and the busy nurses were not eager to go for them. When one of my roomates asked for an extra blanket the nurse said, "Are you *very* cold?" The patient was finally given a man's cotton bath robe to keep out the chill. Another example was the cold coffee that the semi-private patients got every morning. It seems quite possible that hot coffee could have been poured from an insulated container as each tray was delivered, rather than pouring 28 pots of coffee at once and then letting them all get cold.

Nor did the hospital "work" very well in planning of activity. Mistakes were being made continually in medication and treatment of patients. Fortunately the mistakes were not serious ones in the case of myself and my three roommates. Mrs. X for instance was being injected with penicillin every two hours. One night she woke up at the time for her injection. An hour later the nurse came in with the needle and said that she had been too busy to come sooner (this was an experimental case where I should think that accuracy would be all-important). After another two hours when the nurse did not appear again, Mrs. X went to find her. The nurse was having coffee with some other nurses. She insisted that Mrs. X was to have the injection every three hours and refused to look it up on Mrs. X's chart. So Mrs. X waited for another hour until the nurse came in. The next night the nurse had to admit that she had confused Mrs. X with another patient but she made up for her mistake by making the injections very painful until Mrs. X protested. Another example: Miss Y was supposed to receive a certain injection on alternating days. One day the staff doctor came in on the wrong day to give it to her. She objected. The nurse went out to look it up on her chart. When the doctor found out that the patient was right he glared and said, "Hell, it would be easier to give it to her now than to go through all this again". Mrs. Z told us that she had been given a sulfa-drug in another hospital that was destined for her next door neighbor. One morning, at 6 A.M., a nurse leaned over Mrs. Z and whispered loudly, "Are you Mrs. Woist?". Then she came over to me and whispered the same thing to me. She succeeded in waking us all up in order to find Mrs. Woist who was in the next room. Another morning Miss Y., who was to have a metabolism test, was awakened by the nurse at 6 A.M. and told to "Go right back to sleep, dear, and keep very quiet and have a good rest before your metabolism test". (She had been told all about it the night before).

No Neo-Functionalism

In these examples of poor functionalism in the hospital one can also see poor neo-functionalism in (1) the attitude of the nurses and (2) the fact that the hospital does not exist for the patient but the patient for the hospital routine.

(1.)

The first nurse I had just before going into labor cheered me by saying, "Are you accustomed to having such high blood presscure?" The general attitude of the nurse to the patient was that the patient was a nuisance—something to be finished with. There was never any concern over the patient's comfort or her state of mind, no attempt to be encouraging or reassuring. I had entered the hospital with the realization that the nurses would be rushed and overworked and I rang my bell as rarely as possible. But it was discouraging after waiting 20 minutes for a bedpan to be greeted with a "Well, what's the trouble now?" or to be told as I was once, that "You can't have a bedpan now, it's lunch time"! (Here the nurses' attitude is reinforced by the hospital's attitude to the patient). Miss Y, whose hands

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were supposed to have clean dressings applied 3 or 4 times a day, was given this care only once during my stay of a week. It was with the greatest difficulty that she obtained the gauze, etc., so that she might fix them up herself. She had a serious illness and her hands were very painful but because she looked healthy the nurses did not have the imagination or sympathy to realize the importance of helping her.

I came to the conclusion that the nurses' brutal attitude was partly due to ignorance of psychology and no training in the need for mental as well as physical care in illness, and partly to the nurses' sense of their own inferior position. The first is self explanatory but I must add a few words about the second.

The floor nurse has an unenviable position in the hospital hierarchy. At the top of the system are the doctors, who know all and tell the nurse nothing, do the ordering and are not involved in any of the dirty work. Then comes the head nurse. If she is unintelligent, she is likely to be a very unpleasant gauleiter, full of authority and snobbism. Then comes the floor nurse. Poor thing, she is ordered about to make beds, take temperatures, distribute bed pans and enemas, give hypodermics, pills and trays. She is the machine between the doctor and the patient. The machine that keeps the patient alive but which itself becomes dead and mechanical in the process. This nurse, usually overworked and underpaid, can do nothing on her own, she cannot ask questions or answer them, she is not in the confidence of the doctor but merely his tool, she has no means of self expression, no independent will. She cannot even tell the patient what medicine she is giving. No wonder she becomes hard, does the least possible amount of work and appears to hate her charges. She has no pride in her work because it is not hers—she is a transmission belt.

The contrast between these floor nurses and the unpaid nurse's aides—wartime volunteer workers—was extreme. The latter was cheerful, gentle, helpful, as well as efficient. She asked voluntarily if she could do something for you. "Are you comfortable, can I turn your bed up or down", etc. The nurse never. The aide, of course, was doing something novel, only for a short time and voluntarily. She had none of the weight of the hierarchy above her, she had her own independent life outside and of her own free will she could come or go. She was doing the job to be helpful and therefore took pride in doing it well.

The nurse on the other hand was not thanked for her effort by anyone. The cure of the patient was the doctor's glory. If these nurses were given a sense of their own importance by being given, each one, special responsibilities and by being treated in a more equalitarian and fraternal way by the doctors, they would undoubtedly cease taking out their frustrations on their patients.

At the bottom of the hospital ladder was Mary the cleaning woman, who said of the nurses, "I like them like the poison. They don't like me but they need me. I hope they all get drafted". Even below Mary was the Negro woman who cleaned the floors. It was hard to get her to smile. She was the only Negro I saw employed in this vast enterprise.

(2.)

Finally, I found the hospital revolving not around the patient but around the nurses and a rigid schedule. I laughed at my doctor when he sent me back to the hospital to get a rest. Actually I did rest some even though I was awakened every morning between 4 and 6 A.M. Fortunately I and my roommates were ambulatory patients. Semi-private and ward patients who are unable to bathe themselves are bathed at 5 A.M. by the night nurses. Between 4 and 5 o'clock a nurse comes in to put fresh water in the bedside bottles. She rustles and rattles around four or more beds and if any patient sleeps through that process, she is either well drugged or else inured to hospital noise. Then, no matter how poorly one may have slept during the night or how much one is in need of sleep, the bath takes place inevitably at 5. Breakfast is at 8. A friend who was in a maternity ward in another hospital tells me that all the patients, including those who had just had Caesarian babies, had to wash their hands, face and arms and brush their teeth at 4 A.M. Enemas were given at my hospital at about 6 in the morning, often before one was fully awake. One night after I had slept about 3 hours (I had finally induced a nurse to give me a sleeping pill which through some error had not been ordered for me) I rang my bell for a blanket at about 5 A.M. After the blanket had been produced and I was preparing to get a little more sleep the nurse announced "I am going to cathaterize you". I protested that I was exhausted and had had no sleep. "Well", she said, "I can wake you in a half hour and do it then"!

The "Patient-Centered Hospital"

I should like to see a hospital constructed and conducted functionally and neo-functionally for the patient. First of all the rooms would be functional in design and equipment. A major change would be a self-raising bed. Now a patient must wait for the nurse in order to move his position. I used to lie flat for hours, not wanting to bother the nurse, and conversely, try to sleep like a half closed jack-knife, for the same reason. The crank for controlling the movements of the bed is at the foot. Certainly some inventor could create a gadget so that even a sick and weak person could turn a handle and make himself comfortable.

Secondly, continual mistakes would be reduced to a minimum. I can see several possible ways of attaining this end. As it is today, each patient has a chart book which is kept at the head nurse's desk. I would have the reports and orders in these books duplicated and posted at the patient's bedside. I would also favor informing the patient beforehand what medication and tests, etc. he is to undergo, when advisable psychologically. I would also have individual nurses responsible for certain patients instead of the head nurse being responsible for all patients. This would not only be good for the patient but for the nurse also.

Thirdly, the nurses would be trained in psychology as well as anatomy and would become individuals able to express themselves and their human friendliness through their work (not little temperamental sadists as they so often are now). As it is today there is a war on between the nurses and the patients. I strongly advise prospective patients to go into semi-private rooms for their own peace of mind and body, unless they are going to be in need of complete quiet, under the influence of drugs, or equipped with a kindly private nurse. In a semi-private room one can seek physical and mental aid from the other patients. They are usually more friendly and outgoing than in their daily life since they, too, are going through your experience of being alone, sick and against the unknown. The therapeutic importance of this companionship has been recognized by some hospital designers: the patients with communicable diseases are put behind glass partitions so that they may at least have visual company.

In a private room, one is at the mercy of the nurse and one's solitary thoughts. A nurse trained in the psychology of sickness would understand the needs of her patient and would be able to compensate if necessary for the lack of other contacts. There is much talk about psycho-somatic medicine but the following would never occur if it was put into practice in the hospitals. A nurse told me at 10 o'clock

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one morning, "Put on your bathrobe and go to the laboratory down the hall". Perhaps I was over nervous but I would have preferred to be told at 9 o'clock, "Mrs. Macdonald, you are to have a routine physical examination by the floor physician at 10 o'clock.. Will you report at the laboratory down the hall at that time." The first method is autocratic—the nurse has power over and controls the patient and issues a disagreeable order. Psychologically it is disturbing to someone displaced in a frightening hospital situation.* The second method reassures the patient and respects her rights as an individual.

With nurses better trained to care for and think about the needs of their patients, a better relationship between doctors and nurses would follow. The nurse would no longer be the tool of the doctor but his assistant. The nurse would be happier feeling herself more really useful, the doctor and patient would be better served. And there would be a real esprit de corps in cooperation between doctor, nurse and patient. (The same type of spirit that one gets in a really good progressive school between teacher, parent and child).

Finally, the organization of the hospital routine would be suited to the needs of the patient and not to the needs of the organization. Certainly the 5 A.M. reveille would be eliminated. Patients who needed and wanted to sleep late would. A bath missed, a bed unmade, would not become a catastrophe but a relief from unhealthy rigidity. Some may object that my ideas would result in dirt and confusion. But modern psychology shows that the dirt, if some creeps in, will be counteracted by psychologically sound surroundings.

A recent article in *Time* magazine referring to an article by Dr. Harry Bakwin in the New England *Journal of Medicine* states that "about the worst menace to children . . . is the fad for incarcerating them in hospitals . . . In spite of some advantages, a hospital is a poor place for a child to be born in . . . Separating the baby from its mother at birth, instead of allowing it to be cuddled and breast-fed, is a bad beginning . . . The crime is compounded when the baby is put on a clock-ruled feeding schedule, a practice which is almost bound to produce over-anxiety in parents and loss of appetite in children." Here the schedule is obviously made for the hospital and the nurses and not for the patients. In the hospital that I was in, when breast feeding was difficult, the nurses discouraged it in every possible way, since it made more work for them and disturbed their schedule. The means, bottle feeding, was made dominant over the ends, a satisfactory mother-baby situation. At the same time the means was satisfactory only to the nurse and the hospital.

The solution of these problems are merely outlined and generalized here. There are probably many difficulties that I have not taken into account.† But the general picture is, I believe, quite clear. The hospital is another bureaucracy which suffers from the same disease as a totalitarian regime. The plan and organization is rigid, unsatisfying, breeds a race of subhuman tools and insufferable gauleiters and in addition is not efficient. What is needed is more organization and plan for general welfare for the whole (not forgetting in the means—the end). And for the parts of the whole there should be more individualization and decentralization.

NANCY MACDONALD

*The modern hospital has many similarities to a concentration camp. On admission you are asked all sorts of personal questions in order to classify you as to parents, job, religion etc. You are stripped of your own clothes and put into uniform. Your clothes are taken away so that you cannot leave unless you get them back. Communication with the outside world is difficult. You become a very small part of a big machine and lose all individuality. You are tortured mentally by your keepers.

†On the other hand, the criticisms I have made are on the basis of experience at the top financial level of hospital care. The treatment of ward patients and those who go to clinics is even more authoritarian and inhumane than that given the relatively well-to-do patient.

YALTARIAN CULTURE

The adventures of the literary department of the CP during the prolonged Teheran-Yalta dickering (the 6th period) received little attention, but were perhaps even more vivid than Browder's theoretical exploits. As Bridges' "permanent no-strike pledge" was aimed at the workers' resistance, so what might be called the theory of yaltarian literature was intended to liquidate art. Although it seems that the 7th period is being prepared, the following summary of a CP document has value as a contribution to the history of Stalinist perversion.

The most systematic exposition of the theory was presented in *New Masses* of September 12, 1944, in an article called "What Happened to the Slicks?" The author, Wilma Shore, was formerly a contributor to the "little magazine" group. In the article, which appears to be addressed toward this class, she announces her graduation and tells how and why it was achieved. It seems, or seemed, that the *Satevepost* and the other big commercial magazines have undergone a great change, although "it is sometimes necessary to stand way back and squint in order to notice it." Squinting, Miss Shore perceived: "For example, I recently read a women's magazine story in which the wife of a serviceman went out to dinner with an old friend of her husband, and neither he nor she showed the slightest desire to fall into the other's arms. They just went out, had a good steak dinner and a few dances, and parted amicably at the doorstep." This storming of the gates of Literature can hardly be regarded with indifference by the "progressive writer." Such reformation forces him to admit that there is "now enough common ground for the writer and editor to stand on without crowding each other off."

The reasons for this pleasant transformation? Well, "some gleam may be discerned, some reflection of the light from Teheran." Miss Shore tells us that "with very few exceptions, the sincere writer's point of view is simply to win the war. With equally few exceptions, that is also the point of view of the editors and advertisers. So, really for the first time, the writer can write honestly about an important subject and stand a chance of being bought."

She develops this thesis, contrasting it with the unpleasant, little-chance-of-being-bought past. "Today the writer can tell the truth and still hope to make a buck and reach his readers. All during the depression, his stories, to be saleable, had to come out right in the end . . . while in actuality people were frustrated, cynical and deprived." All this is changed, however. The glorious sun of Teheran-Yalta hath risen: "all the signs point to a richer, fuller life for the world, for the individual. . . . Things are getting better, and people know it." At any rate, things are getting better for Miss Shore since she began to sell to the slicks, and she knows it. It follows, naturally, that "to write bitterly and protestingly today is an indication of a lack of fundamental understanding of the period."

Miss Shore notes some passive opposition in the CP cultural ranks. This however is because their culture has not kept up with their politics (which seems to indicate that politics can walk, or run, backwards faster than culture).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"These people, it seems to me, are suffering from a kind of split personality. They have made a sharp distinction between literary literature and commercial writing . . . " But why not "make literature commercial, or commercial writing literary?"[1]

The implications of the yaltarian theory would be repudiated, at least verbally, by most bourgeois literary departments, just as the permanent no-strike was repudiated by reactionary union bureaucrats. What sort of comment is it possible to make upon this?[2] If the Kremlin should direct the liquidation of grandmothers, having discovered that the latter are all inherently anti-Soviet,[3] how many of the American CP's aged relatives would live out that day?

JACK JONES

Memo to Mr. Luce

TO: Mr. Luce

FROM: Dwight Macdonald

SUBJECT: Willi Schlamm's "Notes on the New Magazine"

Although you have not formally asked my advice on this new TIME Inc. project, I know you will be pleased by this evidence of continued interest by a former employee. Perhaps you will also profit by an expert's advice, particularly in view of Mr. Schlamm's amateur standing in the field you now propose to invade, that of intellectual journalism. (Not that I have the slightest objection to Mr. Schlamm's amateurishness in itself; in fact, as I shall show, it is an essential quality for the editor of the kind of magazine you project.) Also, as a stockholder of TIME Inc., I have a natural interest which you will, I am sure, be the first to appreciate, in seeing that my corporation's funds are wisely invested.

The Schlamm memo is preceded by a short note, dated May 21, 1945, stating: "The attached memorandum has been considered by TIME Inc.'s Executive Committee. The Committee's decision: to go ahead, tentatively." This decision, I think, should be reconsidered (and, I venture to predict, *will* be reconsidered.). For the Schlamm memo purposes to square the circle: to publish an anti-cultural cultural magazine. Our civilization is still not historically ripe for such an enterprise. Let me explain.

1. Interesting sidelight on Macdonald's "Theory of Popular Culture."
2. Perhaps that the implication of CP policy in the 6th was *to propose fascism to the bourgeoisie.* And compare Long's prediction that fascism in America will come disguised as anti-fascism.
3. This was for the first time exposed by Comrade Slipsky in his recent *Pravda* thesis. Slipsky made an exhaustive analysis of fifty large Soviet cities, dividing all residents into classes according to their present family status, and then using a method similiar to the Gallup sampling device, ascertained the political tendencies within each class. The results were then collated. The grandmother stratum had much the highest percentage of anti-Fatherland tendencies: 3.2870. As compared to the next highest, .7109. Curiously enough, sons and daughters had an almost identical and the lowest rate: .4221 and .4220, respectively. Comrade Stalin, in awarding Slipsky the rank of Hero of Soviet Thought, pointed out the significance of this, which until then no one but He had perceived: *raising the birth rate is an indispensable method of combatting tendencies inimical to the Fatherland.*

The proposal is for TIME Inc. to publish a cultural monthly which will depend for contributions on such intellectuals as — to name a few listed as "candidates for possibly sustained contact"—W. H. Auden, R. P. Blackmur, T. S. Eliot, Reinhold Niebuhr, George Orwell, and Lionel Trilling. It will thus compete not with any of the categories of existing magazines Schlamm lists — the liberal weeklies, the "serious" monthlies like *Harpers* and the *Atlantic*, or journals like *The New Yorker* and *The Saturday Review of Literature* — but rather with a category which, with his usual prudence, he does not list: such "little magazines" as *Partisan Review, Kenyon Review, Sewanee Review,* and *Politics.* This invasion of a field hitherto, because of its notoriously unprofitable nature, left to irresponsible intellectuals is part of that present-day tendency toward a merging of commercialized culture and serious (or "highbrow") culture which I analyzed in "A Theory of Popular Culture" (*Politics,* February 1944). Schlamm expresses very well the weighty considerations that must have moved TIME Inc.'s Executive Committee to undertake such an invasion at this time:

"No matter what *we* do, new magazines are bound to appear. Towards the end of this war, a lot of people will want to articulate concerns, attitudes and ideas for which none of the established magazines seems to provide the proper amplification . . . Our limited problem is merely: do we want to take out an option? We do, and not only because it may be fun to participate in one of the great mutations of journalism. In this case, fortunately, fun is identical with an objective responsibility: to prevent, with wisdom, a new growth from getting wild and pernicious. There is no historical law that new departures of journalism, following the hysterics of the war, have to end in Menckenism, 'debunking' and adolescent despair. If civilized respect for fundamentals, and mellowing experience, could be combined with a sense of urgency and an understanding of the 'new' (these quotation marks are a masterly touch —DM) the resulting magazine might just as well be adult, constructive and readable . . . Left to themselves, the prospective new magazines of a 'disillusioned' (again, masterly! —DM) postwar period will spread gloomy *Weltschmerz.* Started by men who recall the past and don't dislike it entirely, our magazine might provide the moderate climate that is so essential for any intellectual venture."

These formulations could hardly be improved on. Hitherto, the problem which the existence of a body of intellectuals, with their characteristic irresponsible insistence on criticising the existing order from the standpoint of their own personal values, has been dealt with mostly by the unsubtle and ineffective method of counter-attack. But such well-meant polemics as those of Van Wyck Brooks and Archibald Mac Leish have had the opposite effect from that intended: they have sharpened the lines and driven waverers over into the intellectuals' camp precisely because the issue was posed too nakedly. Now that the atomic bomb and other features of present-day society are lending a dangerous plausibility to the intellectuals' criticisms, more effective measures are necessary. Instead of attacking the intellectuals, Schlamm proposes to join them in order to gently guide them, aided by three-figure pay checks, away from the rocks of despair and the shoals of disillusionment into the safe harbor of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constructive Respect for Fundamentals. It is a project worthy of TIME Inc.'s Executive Committee.

There is also another purpose, more mundane but, to us stockholders, perhaps even more attractive. As Schlamm puts it:

"It seems appropriate that TIME Inc. publishes such a magazine. TIME Inc. is the protagonist, if not the inventor of group journalism. Evidently, group journalism presupposes personal journalism which it puts to more objective use. If this well dries up, the growth goes with it. Clearly, TIME Inc.'s enlightened self-interest should encourage the emergence of mature personal talent. In cultivating it . . . TIME Inc. might solve its grave strategic problem of intellectual supply."

Thus the new magazine will be a kind of fattening-pen from which a constant supply of fresh talent will be supplied to the TIME Inc. abbatoirs. Already TIME Inc. has put a good deal of promising talent "to more objective use"; with a pool like this to draw from, the results should be spectacular. Considering the probable returns on this investment, I think we should caution Schlamm against a parsimoniousness which may be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Thus he writes: "Our magazine wouldn't know what to do with a big editorial staff. It needs three editors, four assistants, three secretaries, and one office boy." It is true that cultural monthlies hitherto have usually scraped along with a couple of part-time and generally unpaid editors, plus one secretary if they were lucky; and that the *Politics* editorial staff consists of just one editor. But these hole-in-the-wall methods are inadequate for a project of the scope of this one, whose editorial staff, whatever the pennypinching Schlamm may think, should above all be BIG. That is one editorial virtue, at least, which our resources can make absolutely certain.

The objectives of the new journal are thus well worth an effort. Nor can I regard Willi Schlamm as anything but an ideal choice for the editor of such a magazine. It has long been a principle of TIME Inc. journalism that the less a writer knows about a field the more he may be trusted to avoid the expert's tedious complexities and niggling discriminations. Schlamm, whose whole previous career has been devoted to a rather crude kind of political journalism, is thus well equipped for his new post. As his memo itself shows, he not only fears and distrusts all "advanced" ideas, but, even better, all ideas *per se*. His ignorance on music, philosophy, political theory, literature, and the fine arts — the subject-matter of the new magazine, in short — is of satisfactory proportions. And above all, he shows in every sentence that common (or vulgar) touch which has been such an important ingredient in the success of our magazines.

His description of the *tone* of the new magazine, which occupies a number of pages, is a masterpiece of prudence. The magazine "cherishes personal style" (but not "affectation" or "freakishness"); it is "thoughtful" (but "abhors pomposity"); it has "definite opinions" (but "does not sell a social nostrum"); it is controversial (but "in the spirit of an earnest disagreement, not of an unconcerned whimsicality"); it will favor "manly cussing" (but "won't stand for the rudeness that nowadays goes for polemical wit" and will "discourage boring *literati* feuds"). In short, the magazine will have all the virtues and none of the drawbacks of every conceivable editorial attitude. Its readers, hopefully described as an "elite", will be equally impressive in a vague sort of way, "neither the partisans who read only to see their bias confirmed, nor the jaded who look for an occasional helping of hot pepper." In a word: "It is a magazine for grown-ups."

The shrewd avoidance of any definite ideas, one way or the other, in the memo is perhaps carried a little too far in Schlamm's 3-point "CODE OF EDITING": "good thinking, good writing, good manners." Also, as a stockholder, I should like to know more about the magazine's contents than that each issue will contain articles, "excerpts from books (new and old)", and a feature "that we might call *Editor's Notebook*." But these are minor complaints. The great good thing is that Schlamm's approach to culture reminds one of those ruddyfaced tweedy men in the whisky ads holding a highball and surrounded by old masters, maps, morocco-bound volumes and other cultural apparatus, the whole ensemble suggesting Casual Distinction and Good Taste. Those ads, I am told, sell a lot of whisky.

On Important Matters, Schlamm is more daring: "We feel satisfied that the standards we have inherited from the Scriptures and the Declaration of Independence are pretty good guesses of what decent people will accept as self-evident truths in another 200 years." The magazine abstains "from political partisanship", but: "Far from sneering at the Tweedledum-Tweedledee nature of our Two-Party system, the magazine sees in it a chance for assured American continuity." Under "(4) Philosophy and Religion", Schlamm does not hesitate to stand Marx on his head in the interest of Soundness: "Even if it had not planned it that way, this magazine would very soon see itself deeply involved in religious matters . . . Disguised as political, 'ideological', economic feuds, all the battles of our epoch come finally down to a desire for religious reorientation. The Church is no longer on the defensive . . . Theology is about to become once more an immensely practical public concern." This is Very Important. I am aware, as no doubt Schlamm is also, of your own keen personal interest in religion as a bulwark against "wild and pernicious" growths in these troubled times. I note that the faculty of our *alma mater*, Yale, has lately decided to emphasize religious instruction, to mention only the most recent of many similar instances. If it can make religion—of the responsible episcopalian variety, of course—intellectually respectable, the new magazine will by that alone have justified itself. I imagine that Schlamm agrees with me—and you.

This is all very well. Furthermore, Schlamm's career, even if we did not have the evidence of the memo, shows he is the man for the job we have in mind. His evolution from the editor of the Austrian Communist paper, *Rote-Fane* through the editing of the liberal-pacifist journal, *Weltbuhne* (whose founder, the impractical and rather pernicious Karl von Ossietsky, was obviously not responsible enough to be entrusted with so influential a journal) and then, over here, first to the featured columnist of the Socialdemocratic *New Leader* and finally to your own confidential adviser, maintained in a private office simply to Think and Correlate—this development at every point reveals a flexibility of spine and a nose for the Main Chance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are absolutely essential for our purposes. I recall with admiration his *New Leader* columns which were unique in leftwing journalism, outside the Stalinist press, in exploiting the polemical tone and method of Westbrook Pegler. My only quarrel with his selection is that we should not give well-paid jobs to European hacks if qualified Americans are available. Would it not be possible to find an American citizen equally well-equipped as to ignorance, vulgarity, and adaptability? On the other hand, perhaps only a foreigner could so completely ape the attitudes of American philistinism.

And yet, despite the suitability of editor and editorial "formula" to the end in view, it remains to add that the project has slight chance of success. The difficulty lies—as always!—with those skittish creatures, the intellectuals. To put the matter crudely: can they be roped in? The urgency of the problem is suggested if we examine the 59 names listed as "candidates for possibly sustained contract." Of these 59 names, we find that 15 are regular contributors to *Partisan Review* (which I take simply because I am familiar with it), and that, if we eliminate some 20 names of economists, scientists and philosophers whose work falls wholly outside PR's field, we find that almost half of the literary-cultural names on the list are PR contributors. Some of the others are closely identified with other "little" cultural magazines. Now these magazines, despite certain counter-tendencies, are on the whole actively opposed to the philistine "constructiveness" and timid banality with which the new magazine will approach cultural matters. Assuming some personal sympathy on the part of their contributors for the values these "little" magazines attempt to further, what reaction may we expect to Schlamm's reference to "a tasteful thinker like Professor Hocking"? Or his section on "The Arts", which begins: "The magazine . . . is resolved to take art seriously." And continues: "The editors and contributors will easily agree on a few simple strategems in their dealings with the arts. For one, this magazine does not promote *avantgarde* . . . " How will they react to this: "Though it didn't help her a lot, Europe kept producing a sort of historico-political essayism that, possibly unimportant otherwise, at least is significant for the troubles of the Old World (Julien Benda, Croce, Ortega y Gasset, Silone, Koestler, et al.). Applied in cautious dosages, this pretty special punditing might add an important dimension to our knowledge of Europe."

The dilemma seems fatal: sentiments like the above are calculated to alienate precisely those who are appealed to as contributors; while sentiments of a different order would alienate you, sir, and your Executive Committee. I note that Margaret Marshall, in a recent *Nation*, complains that our new magazine "will appeal to those liberal readers who are more or less vague, undiscriminating, or confused" and that it will "serve to blur even more the line that divides right from left" — a line that "has already become difficult enough to distinguish." This is comical because it is precisely magazines like *The Nation* that have blurred this line and have rendered their readers as confused and undiscriminating as possible. In this fact, indeed, lies the one slim chance for our venture's success. However, it does not seem enough: the intelligentsia are demoralized, confused, even a bit frightened, but I doubt that they are yet ready for Schlammism. I chance to know personally three people recently approached by Schlamm with an invitation to collaborate; two, after reading the memo, refused; the third thought it pretty much of a joke.

The conclusion seems inescapable: TIME Inc.'s Executive Committee has made a historical miscalculation. Another generation or two of the kind of progress we are now making, and it may be possible to attract the intelligentsia to a magazine whose editorial criteria are drawn partly from Edmund Clarence Stedman and partly from Bernarr MacFadden. But the time, in my opinion, is not yet ripe. I therefore suggest that TIME Inc. wind up the enterprise at once, take its losses, and again confine Mr. Schlamm's flow of ideas to that audience to which they are best suited: you, sir.

Books

THE DYNAMICS OF CULTURE CHANGE; AN INQUIRY INTO RACE RELATIONS IN AFRICA. **By Bronislaw Malinowski. Yale University Press. $2.50.**

This book will be a great disappointment to those who associated the name Malinowski with scientific observation and the love of freedom. While purporting to investigate objectively the phenomenon of culture change, particularly as it is taking place today in Africa under the impact of European imperialism, it is in reality a manual for colonial administrators and others "who have the practical control of African tribes." "The anthropologist has to make himself useful." And after all, "The average British official tries to administer justice and to be a father to his wards." Malinowski constantly refers to those who voice the just grievances of the Africans as "the educated African, upstart, demagogue," "the rantings of the pro-Native."

The dynamics of culture change, Malinowski observes, involves three separately determined categories—"old Africa," "imported Europe" and the "new composite culture." He stresses that this last, partly Europeanized Africa, is definitely new sociologically and not merely a mechanical mixture to be resolved into its European and African elements. "Any analysis of culture change must therefore collate the European intentions or policy with the corresponding African institutions, and assess whether in the process of change the interests of the two sides clash or dovetail."

According to Dr. Malinowski, whenever the two sides dovetail (the principle of the common factor) because of a long-run identity of interests, cultural change is a relatively smooth and simple process. Whenever there is no such identity of interests, clashes and friction are the result. However, Dr. Malinowski is chasing a will-of-the-wisp in his search for the common interest. There is no common measure between the African and his white exploiter, just as there is none between the workers and capitalists at home. There isn't even a common measure between American and British capitalism in the long run, or between American and Japanese capitalism in the short run. Consequently, Dr. Malinowski, since he cannot find the mythical common measure, is faced with the necessity of choosing one side or the other. Invariably he chooses to side with British imperialism:

". . . in my opinion, the British colonial system is second to none in its capacity to learn from experience, its adapt-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ability and tolerance, and above all, its genuine interest in the welfare of the Natives."

Consider, for example, Malinowski's treatment of "the land problem." Here we discover that the main problem is "whether there is or is not enough land"—for *whom* Malinowski does not specify. It is merely a "quantitative question." After briefly running through a history of the "alienation of the land" (or—less politely and less sociologically—robbery), and "the drafting of the Natives for their exploitation", we come to the conclusion that "where there is no White settlement the problems are of much greater simplicity." However, "let us sketch out the positive approach." Starting from our common factor, "the right to exist on a level of elementary decency is indeed the fundamental principle of justice and equity", we immediately note that we *cannot* start from it. Having gotten off to a bad start, we comment on our original common factor (viz. that the Natives must be kept alive in order to limit some of these (rights), but the Natives must be granted a substantial margin for subsistence." By all means—or they will die off. Having established our real common factor (viz. that the Natives must be kept alive in order to be exploited effectively) we may now proceed.

"Here is no question of returning to the original status quo. The very fact that the European came, and that they control African soil and its production, even though indirectly in some cases, is a complete annulment of any 'original' rights or titles. What we shall need is a study of conditions as they are now." The man worships, not ancestors, but What Is. Malinowski is a practical politician, not a sociologist; his book is a manual for colonial administrators.

The next institution that Malinowski examines is his favorite, since it embodies the common measure to an even greater degree. Indirect rule, which is a form of colonial administration through native leaders and chieftains, has as its "object to create in Native authority a devoted and dependable ally, controlled, but strong, wealthy, and satisfied." Indirect Rule is nothing but sociological double-talk for a quisling government, which by buying off the local chieftains, and/or impressing them by force of arms, succeeds as the British have in India, Africa and other colonies in ruling through local agents. Malinowski is full of suggestions on how to improve this system which Hitler made notorious in Europe, not the least of which is to increase the chief's salary "to meet fixed liabilities for the clothing of his wives and domestic servants." He also suggests a system of "differential education of chief and commoner" whereby the illiterate chief will learn how to sign his name to British treaties. It is evidently not necessary for the "commoner" to learn this great art. By these and other means Malinowski hopes to enhance the prestige of the chief, who will thus be in a better position to perform his dirty work for the British.

Malinowski's comments on the institution of witchcraft are vague and generalized, and I believe for a very good political reason. Second to the chieftain as the most important member of the African community was the witch-doctor, who, since the chieftains are completely corrupted and functioned as part of the British imperialist system, became the logical pole for oppositional elements. If we know anything about anti-imperialist movements, we know that they frequently are not directly political, but take complex, often indirect, forms. It is noteworthy that witchcraft has had a tremendous increase in activity, particularly "in the mine compounds, the urban locations, plantations" —in short, in the areas of greatest exploitation and domination by the Whites. It is not growing appreciably in the native communities. Malinowski is either unaware or dishonestly silent about the political implications of this movement which is no mere recrudescence of religious fanaticism. Political movements frequently take diverse channels of expressions. It is no accident that the foreign imperialists and the native chieftains have succeeded in driving it underground where it flourishes even more vigorously. While Malinowski does not make any association between the admitted growth of African nationalism which he sees only among the African intelligentsia and not among the "detribalized Natives" (the new African proletariat) and the increased vigor of "witchcraft", I am certain that much of what Malinowski terms "witchcraft" is nothing more than crude political opposition to imperialism on the part of the new African proletariat who have as yet had very limited political experience through direct forms such as trade unions or parties.

Throughout the book, Malinowski gives urgent and frequent warnings to the Whites that African nationalism is growing and is becoming "a collective body of opinions which may not be an irrelevant factor" in dealing with the Africans. Malinowski is not entirely without conscience, for he immediately adds that "the anthropologist should have as one of his duties not to act as a spy, still less as an agent-provacateur . . ."

Nevertheless this agent warns the Whites that the Africans are restless, and their grievances cannot be ignored indefinitely. The policy of the blunt imperialists is leading to a political impasse, an ugly situation. What is needed is a policy of enlightened imperialism which will be flexible under pressure. This sort of attitude will seem to the superficial reader as the embodiment of a genuine concern for the African's welfare. But Malinowski's concern for the African is that of the fisherman for the habits of fish; sociology becomes a collection of facts about the hunted in order to guide the hunter. "Practical anthropology" is *scientific* exploitation.

This book is, in short, a contemptible example of the corruption of science. It illustrates the way in which the intelligentsia is turned into a mechanized skilled labor force, integrated with the needs of the ruling class. Malinowski should have investigated the sociology of sociologists.

HELEN CONSTAS

THE PROBLEM TEACHER. **By A. S. Neill. International University Press. $2.50.**

Although the most creative thought on education has been American, the most creative practice has been English. This is due chiefly to two factors: the English tradition of the boarding school and the greater emancipation of the English intellectuals from the Puritan tradition. The most interesting English experimental schools are Dartington Hall, Beacon Hill, and Summerhill. The first is so heavily endowed (by the Willard Straight Estate) and its career so smooth that it cannot be regarded as typical. For different reasons Beacon Hill, founded by Bertrand and Dora Russell in 1926, is equally untypical. Directing the School alone after her divorce, Dora Russell found the going very rough in an England that forgives her upper classes' clandestine pleasures, but condemns to obloquy all whose conduct is forthright and unashamed. A revolutionary whose vision was not limited to the merely political, Dora Russell, haunted always by poverty, was pushed from pillar to post until German bombs forced a final removal to Cornwall where, with the remnants of staff and students, she continues to carry on.

The story of Summerhill is different. The founder, A. S. Neill, came slowly to revolution and therefore was tolerated in the years when Dora Russell was harassed by the British

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascists and ignored by the liberals. The son of a Scotch schoolmaster, Neill was fired with the idealism that stirred European youth after World War I. In 1921 he became director of the famous International School at Hellerau near Dresden where the foundations of the good life were to be laid through the education in simple surroundings of children of all nationalities, creeds and races. Here for a time experimentation was successful and life was happy, but no educational Shangri-La could survive the economic crises of Germany in the twenties. After a brief interval in Austria, where conditions were no better, the school was forced to close its doors, and Neill returned to England.

Still convinced that the path to a better world lay through education, Neill opened a school of his own where he hoped to create in miniature a society under freedom, with no taboos and no fears. The story of Summerhill, dubbed by its enemies That Dreadful School—when a father expressed fear that his son might learn to masturbate at Summerhill, Neill replied, "Why not? It did not do you and me much harm, did it?"—is told in Neill's series of delightful "problem" books beginning with *The Problem Child.* This was followed by *The Problem Parent,* for Neill was one of the first to call attention to the parental background, and his book on that subject is salutary reading for the most sophisticated. This latest book, *The Problem Teacher,* published in England in 1939 before the outbreak of war, brings Neill's work to fruition. His twenty-year concentration on education has convinced him that the real problem is neither the child nor the parent nor the teacher; the real problem is society. Now this is a truth that any Marxist could have told Neill years ago, as no doubt many did. But his slow progress to this discovery is not to be regretted. For in his progress, Neill has achieved a brilliant synthesis of the findings of Marxism, of psychology, and of anthropology. What Neill has to say today is of profound importance because his contributions are the result not of labored and wishful thinking in the isolated study, but of observation of life in the laboratory that is his school.

Neill has been much impressed by the work of the radical German psychologist, Wilhelm Reich, whose book, *Der Sexuelle Kampf de Jugend,* is a study of the use by the State of sex repression as a means of keeping the working class in its place. Long a Freudian, Neill has come to see the futility of merely showing up causes, with no plan for translating theory into action. Marxism furnishes such a plan, though Neill demonstrates that its most vocal contemporary exponents are chary of extending their analysis to every phase of society. The Marxists, Neill states, proclaim that hunger is a political question, but fail to see that sex is equally a political question, for economic suppression and sex repression go hand in hand. The Marxist, like the Freudian, fears freedom as much as does the Calvinist: "Sex is a creative force in life and our revolutionaries hope to remake the world by ignoring it, hope to remake it by their heads alone."

In a stimulating chapter, "The Teacher and the State," Neill's synthesis is reminiscent of the early work of Engels, whose conception of freedom was considerably broader than that of later Marxists. Having made the point that the function of the school, the barrack-yard of the State, is to breed yes-men with proper humility and respect for the status quo, Neill shows that the school is after all merely an extension of the home upon which the State depends for its safety. The home is the State in miniature; "it aims at respectability and conformity and sexual purity, and even the happiest home has something of the prison atmosphere in it . . . it tends to breed citizens who accept easily . . . it is dangerous because it dams up emotion that should flow out beyond the walls of the garden." The mold once firmly set in the home, the school's job is so thoroughly to deaden the senses that the end product is a sort of witless Van der Lubbe, docile victim and pliable tool. It is not without significance that the most terrifyingly brutal and sadistic State of modern times was one where the family was most close-knit and the authoritarian tradition in education was strongest.

The road to the good life, then, Neill discovered, is not through the schools. This lost illusion does not leave him crushed, however. His work in the free environment of Summerhill has given a significant glimpse of what the future society under freedom may be like, and he finds it good. To attain it, we have not only to conquer the economic problem, but also to surmount the hurdles of family and sex repression. The dramatic swing from left to right of the Soviet laws on education, marriage, divorce, abortion, and illegitimacy as the revolution has receded in recent years is solid confirmation of Neill's contention that sex repression and economic suppression go hand in hand.

VERA FULTON

THE BARRICADE AND THE BEDROOM

For a long time conservatives have stressed the biological immutability of man's nature, whereas progressives have emphasized the social plasticity of his character structure. Conservatives have tried to buttress every status quo by appealing to the biological instincts of man. Now Paul Goodman seeks to overturn a particular status quo by appealing to the apparently same instinctual nature.* He

*Re: Paul Goodman's "The Political Meaning of some Recent Revisions of Freud," which appeared in *Politics,* July, 1945. Most of Goodman's discussion is in criticism of Fromm and Horney. We are not here concerned with their defense, although in passing we must note that most of what Goodman criticizes is his own misunderstanding of their position. We wish, rather, to examine his positive assumptions, the theories upon which he tries to stand and which he uses as a critical lever. Fromm and Horney are part of a general drift in current research and theory which moves toward a historical and a sociological psychology. We agree wholly with that drift and with its positive political relevance. It is the political meaning of this general drift—which Goodman opposes—rather than details in the work of these particular writers which we discuss here. C.W.M. & P.J.S.

CONTRIBUTORS

George Woodcock is an English poet and journalist who edits the anarchist cultural quarterly, "Now" . . . **J. Hampden Jackson** is the author of "A History of Europe Since 1918"; his article is reprinted from the American anarchist magazine, "Why," which in turn reprinted it from the English monthly, "Contemporary Review" . . . **Jack Jones** lives in Brooklyn, he attended Swarthmore College, is a contributor to "New Directions," and now works as a reader for Twentieth Century Fox films . . . **Helen Constas** does graduate work at the New School for Social Research . . . **Vera Fulton** teaches school; she has contributed to "The Modern Monthly" and other magazines . . . **C. Wright Mills** and **Patricia J. Salter** both work at the Bureau of Applied Social Research in New York City; Mills, a regular contributor to "Politics," is working on a book-length study of the white-collar worker . . . **C. J. Stevens** lives in Atchison, Kansas; he describes himself as "a member of the Socialist Party, leftwing within that group but not very active because of the nature of my work."

Correction: The word "impotence" was wrongly printed as "importance" in the fourth sentence from the end of Dwight Macdonald's article, "The Bomb," in the last issue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presents us with a metaphysics of biology in which he would do no less than anchor a revolution.

The difference between Goodman's metaphysics and, for example, Max Eastman's ("Socialism Doesn't Jibe with Human Nature") is that Eastman roots the existing economic order in his biology, whereas Goodman uses his as a lever to overturn capitalism and institute anarchism. If, says Eastman, current institutions, especially private property, are upset, "the technique of modern industry and education are left at the mercy of the naked instincts of a savage tribe." If, says Goodman, man's instincts, especially the sexual, are released, he might not be neurotic and indeed might build a new heaven on earth: "Unrepressed people will provide for themselves a society that is peaceful and orderly enough." There is, writes Eastman, a "drive" . . . a "veritable passion . . . for regimentation and discipleship, for being lead, for obeying and conforming . . ." etc. And regardless of "how much they may be repressed or directed by training" such "drives reappear in the original form." Goodman, on the other hand, drawing from Reich, thinks that the direct cause of "the submissiveness of the people to present political rule of whatever kind" is the "repression of infantile and adolescent sexuality." On the basis of the uninhibited release of such sexuality he would rest genuinely free and humane (not savage) institutions. You choose your biology and you get your political order.

The key tactic of these political appeals to biology is the masking of ethical choices by a metaphysics of biology. The confusion of moral choices with theories of the biology of personality development is an underlying inadequacy of Goodman's essay.

The speculative insight that man's social existence determines his consciousness has been continually verified by modern social psychology. Goodman admits to difficulties in understanding the sociological theory of personality-formation. He states that if personality is not developed according to the Freudian model, it must be "apparently sprung from nowhere." Thus, he does not see types of childhood, biography, and social structure in their intricate and sophisticated inter-relations. He apparently fails to understand that *social* integrations of impulse and feeling in one phase of the psychic structure may not be adequate to meet the *social* demands of subsequent roles. But, of course, it is from such socially created tensions that neuroses, as well as many psychological capacities for social change, may arise.

There is a general continuity between the Fromm-Horney sociological revision of Freud and the anti-psychologism of Marx. One aspect of this continuity is the idea that the problems of a particular social structure — including the neuroses of its members — cannot be reduced to those of man's biological nature. To assume that the biological organism can be used as a basis for judgment about an existing social structure, or a wished-for one, is simply to biologize the social contract theory of the state and of institutions in general.

The capitalist market cannot be derived from a study of the economic man, nor can the frustration which it causes be understood by examining man's *formal* biological equipment. Indeed, the specific impulses which sustain economic man are shaped by their operations on various types of markets. Impulses are given *content* only by the participation of men in given institutions. The content of frustrations—and the severe political directions which they may take—are dependent upon the particular institutions men create.

Goodman is concerned lest a sociological psychology lose "the revolutionary dynamics of instinctual conflict to bring about institutional change at all." He believes that "it is the direct action of these immediate instincts [sex, hunger, etc.] that has the power to make a revolutionary change." Thus, he locates the dynamics of revolution in a tension between biology and institutions, and rests his hope for revolution upon a mass biological release.

This gonad theory of revolution would be the more amusing if Goodman attempted to interpret any known revolution with it. Then, the historical dynamics of class structures, the gap between tantalizing aspirations and deprivations socially rendered, the sudden defeat of mass armies, the grip of ideologies, the slow growth of counter-loyalties—all the shifts in institutional structure, as well as the distributions of power, property, and prestige, Mr. Goodman would have somehow to pull, like historical rabbits, from his biological hat. Apparently the positions held and the interests assumed by class members are not relevant to revolutionary dynamics. Thus, if the capitalist managers of GM become "orgastically potent," they would be as likely to overthrow the institution of private property as would "released" and organized workers.

The dynamics of revolution go on within institutional structures. The motives of individual men engaging in movements for or against the status quo must be understood in terms of the differing positions they occupy within these structures, and in terms of the biographies they seek to live out within and beyond the circles of their society. The locus of freedom, and of the historical dynamic, is not the gonads but the political and economic order.

The sphere of erotics is not connected with the economic and political order in the direct way, and certainly not in the direction, which Mr. Goodman apparently believes. Although no general rule governs the relation, it would seem that political energies more frequently go with sexual asceticism; and lack of sexual inhibition with lack of political initiative. One can easily compare sexually free and easy characters with sexually ascetic revolutionary leaders.

In modern society, man, when alieniated from his work, may well turn to "sex." Dr. Reich may have implemented in various cases this secular process and given it his authoritative approval. But "sexually released" men do not turn against the institutions which ruin one of their major chances for self-expression—creative work. On the contrary, given current institutions, what Durant has called, "the machinery of amusement" seizes precisely upon "sex" and exploits it as the central value of "fun" and "glamor". The circle of "orgastic potency" is much more likely to be from bedroom to bedroom, than from bedroom to barricade.

"Orgastic potency" is not the key to "freedom"; much less is it the lever of revolution. Within the broad range of sexual expression open to the species, the freely rational man will "place" sex in his life scheme as one value among others. Since many men, as formed by contemporary institutions, are neither free nor rational, they are not fully capable of so locating sex. Victor Mature and Betty Grable are thus the current images of "orgastic potency." We do not see what their antics nor those of their imitators have to do with freedom or with revolution. As values in a style of life for free men and women, they are more likely to lead away from serious concern with political injustice.

Historically, as Max Weber has noted, sex has frequently been socially and psychically linked with religion and magical orgiasticism. Sex is among the great irrational forces, and when it is cultivated, either by certain types of psychoanalytic therapy or by any other ideological manipulation, it may become eroticism: an end and a value in itself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The enhancement of sex into eroticism as a central value in modern culture must be understood in connection with the social structure of feudal honor and vassalship. Later forms of this development, including the rationalist development of modern vocational man, would have to be studied for the full picture. In short, what role "sex" plays in the development and lives of different types of men is in very large part a problem of the sociological history of the values attached to sex.

"The kingdom of freedom" of which Marx and the left in general have dreamed involves the mastering of one's fate. A free society entails the *social possibility* and the psychological capacity of men to make rational political choices. The sociological theory of character development conceives of man as capable of making such choices *only* under favorable institutional conditions. It thus leads to an emphasis upon the necessity of changing institutions in order to enlarge man's capacity to live freely. But to root freedom in the release of biological instinct denies to man this capacity for rational freedom; it turns freedom over to the gratification of protoplasm. If we accept Goodman's concept of freedom, the cultivation of biological "release," freedom becomes identified with the fixed irrationalities of the leisured and private life.

Rationality and freedom are values which must be socially achieved. But in the Rousseauian conception, which Goodman apparently holds, freedom is "naturally" given to individual men. To flower, it needs only release from institutional bondage. But, in fact, it is a freedom which would make man a slave to biological instinct and deny the rational component of freedom as social achievement.

Freedom does have as its condition specifiable institutional arrangements. But its locus is not between man's biological impulses and institutions. In all societies of which we know, these impulses are structured and defined in their content by whatever values prevail for given men. Men in society learn to will what is objectively required for the enactment of institutionalized roles. And values and slogans legitimize these roles and the trained impulses which sustain their enactment. Freedom lies in choice of roles being open to individuals and to classes of individuals. Its locus is the institutional arrangement of these roles, not the absence of conflict between biologically given drives and the structure of institutions.

The psychological problem of a socialist movement is not how to release the "orgastic potencies" of men but how to make men rationally and critically aware of where their interests lie and how they may realize them collectively.

A socialist view of human nature will recognize fully that man is a historical creature. It will not mask its humane scheme of values by a metaphysics of biology. It will recognize the collective conditions of work which exist under capitalism and which will continue to exist in any modern industrial society. It will see in immense detail how the institutions of such collective work, pegged upon bureaucratized private property, make for the alienation of man from one of his key chances to contact reality creatively. It will see that the chances of individual men rationally to work out their life plans are increasingly expropriated by the spread and clutch of corporative institutions. The goal of a socialistic movement and the ideology it will seek to develop, will be fitted to these facts.

It is because of the dependence of individual man's "innermost being" upon institutions that he should be given this chance to plan what shape these institutions may take, for only by changing his social structure can he collectively change his individual self. The problem of freedom cannot be adequately stated in terms of the unhampered expression of the individual's biological instincts. Freedom, as well as other values for which we should strive, must be viewed in terms of institutional structures and the opportunity for rational social planning. Leave Mr. Goodman with his revolution in the bedroom. We have still to search out the barricades of our freedom.

C. WRIGHT MILLS AND PATRICIA J. SALTER

REPLY:

These authors confound two different issues: (a) the "biological" vs. the "social"; (b) "human nature" vs. "historical character." On the first point it is the Freudian view that our inherited nature is social thru and thru; this also is the view, e.g., of Proudhon and Kropotkin and Marx and Engels; all these are therefore social-psychologists rather than individual-psychologists; they develop different, but mostly quite compatible, pictures of the original social nature. For instance, Marx and Engels regard cooperative production as the biological determinant of the emergence of our species and therefore they correlate the erect posture with the freeing and perfecting of the hand; Freud, laying more stress on reproduction, correlates erect posture with the loss of the sense of smell, the primacy of sight and hearing, the exposure of the genitals. Now communication is inherited; the dependency and educability of infants is inherited; the forming of the ego on the exemplars that gratify and deprive, and conversely the merging of the mother's ego with the infant's; and the extraordinary parallel development of pleasure-zones and object-choices, resulting in the connection of seeing, embracing and copulating—all this elaborate pattern of social function must be inherited. But furthermore, for Freud, there is no such thing as pleasure except in function—pleasure, as he says, is "anaclitic"—therefore it is reasonable to regard uncoerced desire as a social force. These propositions are commonplace, but I fail to see how they are trivialized by quotations from Max Eastman. One does not "choose" one's biology. Certainly I may be omitting or wrongly estimating certain biological facts, but this must be shown biologically, not by dismissing biology from the argument.

The authors have a curious misconception of my political position, and, I may say, of the libertarian position in general. We are not asserting that the liberation of instinct will of itself produce a "heaven on earth"; good institutions are cooperative inventions, they come to be as adjustments and transformations of historical conditions, they are certainly not inherited. But we assert that the repression of instinct makes good institutions unattainable. And by and large, since the instincts are elaborately organized, the repression of some will entail the repression or violent reaction of others. The importance of sexuality especially can be wrongly estimated: when it is free, it is only one among several productive forces; but when it is repressed it is the most important destructive influence that there is. I should certainly agree that "political energies go with sexual asceticism": these are precisely the energies that we see in the sadism and masochism of monolithic parties and in transitional dictatorships that become permanent. Let me refer the authors who blab so glibly about "pulling historical rabbits out of a biological hat," to Reich's brilliant history of the sex-reform movement in Soviet Russia, 1919-1935 (in *The Sexual Revolution*, 1945).

To turn to the second issue, human nature and history: in general, "human nature" refers to a potentiality and as such can only be observed in its acts, which are historical. Human nature is inferred positively from great achievements, from the lively promise of youngsters, etc.; it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inferred negatively from the dire effects of obvious outrages. "Conservatives," say these authors, "have stressed the biological immutability of man's nature, whereas progressives have emphasized the social plasticity of his character-structure." Now I hoped that I had made it clear that original nature was different from character-structure, which is in every case a good or bad organization of one's experiences, conflicts, and opportunities: good when the organization implements and actualizes one's powers, bad when it depresses them. Then is it the fact that radicals—not "progressives"—have emphasized the plasticity of original nature rather than cried out precisely against the outrages against it? I need not mention the anarchists and utopian-socialists who have drawn especially on the French revolutionary word Fraternity, the eros that creates institutions. But is it so sure that Marx and Engels belived that there was no original nature or that it was unimportant? Is it not their position that we must destroy class institutions just in order that true humanity, with its tragedies, can assert itself? Let me cull a few quotations (they are in Venable's *Human Nature: the Marxian View*, which I happen to have to hand): "These Londoners," says Engels, "have been forced to sacrifice the best qualities of their human nature—a hundred powers which slumbered within them have remained inactive, have been suppressed . . . The dissolution of mankind into monads, of which each one has a separate principle, is here carried out to its utmost extreme . . . One shrinks from the consequences of our social state and can only wonder that the whole crazy fabric still holds together." The manufacturing division of labor, says Marx, "cuts at the very roots of the individual's life;—to subdivide a man is to execute him . . . The subdivision of labor is the assassination of a people." It makes the worker "a cripple, a monster, by forcing him to develop some highly specialized dexterity at the cost of a world of productive impulses and faculties." Again, is not the Marxian meaning of alienation the divorce, under the pressure of commodity-institutions, of man's consciousness from his nature? Lastly, in the glorious passage in the Gotha critique that goes "in a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not merely a means to live but has become itself the primary necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all round development of the individual"—is not Marx returning, in a higher phase, to something like the "character-structure" of primitive communism, and indeed to the original biological emergence of the species as cooperative producer?

On the other hand, is it not just the fascists—not the "conservatives"—who have most relied on the notion that by fear, repression, and coordination a man can be made to conform to any symbols whatever? I am not implying that the authors are fascists, but that they are indeed progressives—not radicals. I wonder, however, since we are not to speak of inherited powers and their realization and cultural perfection, exactly on what do these progressives base their "humane scheme of values?" *Where do they find the motives for their Sociolatry?*

As to the points the authors make by the way, I confess that most of them seem to me to be rubbish. "The machinery of amusement seizes upon sex and exploits it as the central value of fun and glamor"—what on earth has this to do with liberating the sexuality of children and 13-year-olds? On the contrary, would the exploitation of sex be possible except for the prior inhibition? One cannot create popular culture except on the basis of desire, and "glamor" is just the flaunting of the mysterious and habitually forbidden. I am sure that we are all grateful for the newsy item from Max Weber, especially for the bashful fact that sex has frequently been socially linked with religious orgiasticism. What do you know? By all means let us keep the role of "sex" well within quotation marks, for it is by the sociological history of "values" that we procreate the race. It is also, no doubt, by the "institutional arrangement of the social roles" that my thumb freely opposes its four fingers. And certainly it must have been only after a close study of unnecssarily centralized technology, the subdivision of labor for profits, the sabotage of invention and inventiveness, the discipline of the time-clock, and the premiums on wasteful planning, that the authors assure us that " the collective conditions of work which exist under capitalism will continue to exist in any modern industrial society"—for do they not also exist in the Soviet Union, and didn't they beat Japan?

PAUL GOODMAN.

NEW PAMPHLETS

Just in from England:

Workers in Stalin's Russia, by M. L. Berneri ..... 50¢

Two studies of Africa:

Kenya, the Land of Conflict, by Jomo Kenyatta ..... 35¢

African Empires and Civilization, by Raymond Michelet ..... 50¢

(75¢ for the 2)

British Social Statistics:

The National Income (Common Wealth Information Bulletin) 25¢

Poverty and Inequality (same) ..... 25¢

Facts for Socialists (latest edition of the famous Fabian statistical survey) ..... 40¢

The Problem of Child Crime, by James Hemming ..... 25¢

($1 for all 4)

Now, No. 4 (a new cultural quarterly) ..... 50¢

Kropotkin:

The Wage System ..... 15¢

Revolutionary Government ..... 15¢

The State ..... 35¢

(50¢ for all 3)

Two basic C.I.O. pamphlets:

Substandard Wages } ..... 15¢ for both
Half a Million Forgotten Workers }

ALL PRICES INCLUDE POSTAGE. ORDER FROM POLITICS, 45 ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

The English publisher, Victor Gollancz, has just sent us, for free distribution among *Politics* readers, 1500 copies of his pamphlet: "What Buchenwald Really Means." This is a moving and well-documented refutation of the "all Germans are guilty" propaganda. Available to our readers, without charge, singly or in bundles of up to 50.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Intelligence Office

IN DEFENSE OF PATTON-HALSEY

SIR:

I have just read "Atrocities of the Mind" in the August POLITICS. Such speeches as you quote were never intended to be heard by the people back home. Men at the front speak a different language.

I am completely disgusted with your article. Must you completely cast down a man, without once looking to his better side? Certainly he must have something on the ball if he leads his men as he does.

As for your persecution of Bull Halsey—it is very unwarranted. I have served under this great admiral, and I am willing to square off for him any time.

A DISGUSTED MEMBER OF OUR ARMED FORCES.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

SIR:

General George S. Patton, Jr., is not the only General Officer in the U. S. Army. His speeches, together with his mannerisms and cultural attitude, are not representative of all officers in the Army. True, he is very colorful, greatly publicized, speaks violently and uninhibited, but also he is a good general. As long as we remember that that is all he is, and do not expect his speeches to be profound declarations of dialectics or holy wisdom, we can dismiss his speeches as only those of a successful general who helped defeat the Jerries.

As General Patton is unqualified to tell Dwight Macdonald how to publish POLITICS, so is Mr. Macdonald very unqualified to tell General Patton how to fight a war, or how to address his men prior to entering battle. True his Sunday School and public utterances may not be in the best of taste or decency, but he is only a General, and his words are not those of an Angel, but of a militarist who thoroughly hates Germans as any one would who has fought against them.

But the D-Day-Minus-One speech wasn't for Sunday School kids, or for civilians, or for an evening gathering of "holier-than-thou" pacifists. No, he's addressing a particular group of men, a group of soldiers all over 18. How else would you talk to a group of men . . . who would soon be falling in battle . . .? No, he wasn't talking to Dwight Macdonald or any of his creed, or to those of the OWI either, but an audience of whom a large percentage would soon be dead. And he wasn't talking to the graduating class at the University of Chicago, but to men of all cultural backgrounds, whose chief desire was to be back home out of this damn mess, but who in a few days would be killing Jerries and getting killed themselves.

General Patton's speech is the kind that would appeal to a bunch of GI's, that would make them want to do their best in combat, not because the GI's are of lower intellectual levels than the readers of POLITICS but because they've "shoveled s- - t in Louisiana" . . . No, Patton was talking the language of GI's, or doesn't Macdonald know many GI's?

I'm only sorry that now the war is over, Mr. Macdonald won't have a chance to enter the army and learn what it's all about. It would do him some good.

2ND LT. JOSEPH MINSKY.

CAMP MAXEY, TEXAS.

. . . These apologies for Patton are based on two arguments: (1) The war was a just one; therefore, it had to be won; to win it, good generals are needed; Patton is a good general; therefore, Patton is justified. (2) Army life is radically different from civilian life; therefore, it is foolish to criticise its values from a civilian standpoint. Both arguments raise the problem of means and ends.

(1) I never thought World War II was a just war. But accepting this premise for the sake of argument, I'd say that far from the justness of the war excusing Patton's barbarism, Patton's barbarism calls into question the justness of the war. There is something suspect about an end which calls for such means. As I have noted before, Patton is my favorite general because he expresses so naively the real nature of World War II.

(2) That life in the U. S. Army is more brutal and inhumane than civilian life is true, but this fact would seem to be something to be criticised and changed rather than accepted as a law of nature. If it cannot be changed, then, if we are serious about our humane values, we must reject the war which requires such instruments to achieve its ends. Also: my correspondents would wall off military from civilian society, whereas I would do just the opposite: extend civilian values throughout the armed forces. What is actually taking place is, of course, something worse than either of these alternatives: a breaking down, indeed, of the wall between military and civil society, but in the sense that the former is reshaping the latter.

Recent events throw some light on both the above points. The behavior of many American soldiers in Europe shows just what, as Lt. Minsky puts it, our Pattonized army "is all about." (See "The Soldier Reports" elsewhere in this issue.) And General Patton himself has shown what he "is all about" in what is, even for him, a definitive manner. I refer, of course, to his September 22 interview, in which he stated that "this Nazi thing is just like a Democratic and Republican election fight" and added that he had, personally, "never seen the necessity of the de-nazification program." As military governor of Bavaria, Patton had kept reactionaries and ex-Nazis in power and had treated Jewish refugees—according to a recent official report to President Truman—just about as the Nazis had, except for killing them. These facts—which of course were known to the press and the authorities for months—were brought out in public after Patton's de-nazification interview, and General Eisenhower, on October 2, replaced him as military governor. The interesting question arises: can my correspondents, consistently, approve of Eisenhower's action? Any reply by them will be gladly printed here.

May I add that I do know quite a few members of the armed forces—a remarkably large number of our subscribers are in this category—and that, just as Patton is not the only general, so my two correspondents are not the only soldiers and sailors?—D. M.

ATOMIC FISSION AND REVOLUTION

SIR:.....

The atomic bomb destroyed more than Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It destroyed some of the fundamental assumptions on which the revolutionary socialist movement has based itself ever since the late nineteenth century. But unfortunately, from reading the left-wing press (particularly Marxist publications such as *Fourth International* and *New International*) one would hardly know a change had occurred. The harnessing of atomic energy by man is of greater significance to human society than was the Industrial Revolution and the Revolution of Marx and Engels.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A new epoch has violently opened upon a still blinking humanity—the Atomic Age. The world as we have known it has been blown to dust at Hiroshima—and yet not only the masses, but even the revolutionary avantgarde seems to be asleep to the fact!

Fundamental conceptions of the class struggle, power politics, state and class relationships—all these must be re-examined, modified and radically changed. A critical revaluation in the light of the Atomic Age is of immediate importance. But what appears in the theoretical organs of the revolutionary left? Only redundant platitudes, practically identical with those in all the bourgois journals: Atomic energy can be a force for good and create a higher type of civilization, or it can be a force for evil and destroy humanity.

And then the theoreticians proceed to discuss polemical questions, as if all was well and nothing changed! (POLITICS was the only leftist magazine which at least attempted to probe deeper into these newly-created catastrophic problems. Happily, it seems to be breaking steadily away from the general school of Romantic Revolutionists who still dream nostalgically of the barricades of Paris and Vienna—and reason along these same utopian lines when tackling practical problems of the class struggle.)

Let us face the issues honestly and boldly. The atom bomb has placed an all-powerful club in the hands of the ruling class. In the near future, popular revolutions in Paris, Madrid or Athens will be able to be destroyed by pressing a button in London or New York.

Clearly, a new revolutionary orientation is in order. Some concepts appear immediately obvious:

1. All programs of physical insurrection (i. e. mass military or armed action by the working class) are reduced to the ludicrous. This means that:
2. New programs based on non-violent techniques must be evolved.
3. The entire emphasis of socialists must be radically shifted from the traditional concept of organized mass action to individual action.
4. These new techniques of struggle will probably stress the strike, sabotage, boycott and civil disobedience.
5. Finally, these new concepts must rest on the basic premise that the Modern Total State will disintegrate and decay from its own internal contradictions and conflicts, and that all that will be necessary to bury it, will be the agitation, rebellion, and tearing down of individual and spontaneous units.

Unless this assumption be true, the Total State will become a super-Frankenstein, with the earth securely in its grasp.

HERBERT ORLOFF.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

BLURB

SIR:

Nicola Chiaromonte's essay in the last issue is, to my knowledge, the first and only adequate critical treatment Koestler has received in this country. It was about time.

CLEMENT GREENBERG.

NEW YORK CITY.

JAZZ OVERSIMPLIFIED?

SIR:

Mr. Steig's piece on Jazz in the August POLITICS contains some unfortunate misconceptions. It is possible that his difficulties arise out of his attempt to oversimplify. Art cannot be reduced to mere psycho-societal equivalents. I should think the Commies convincingly proved that a decade ago in the era of "proletarian literature." Perhaps Mr. Steig was away at the time.

Far from being a "tension between time and melody," one of the characteristics of Jazz is the *integration* of time and melody. That is, the melody is played rhythmically and with such sensitivity to time that the beat is expressed within the melody itself. This occurs in all Jazz ensemble playing and most solo work. The integration of this melodic beat with the beat of the rhythm section plus a certain precise regularity in the generation of the beats, help produce various inner sensations described as "lift," "bounce," "rockin'," Swing, Jump, etc. These are sensations of freedom and not of tension. And at the most this is only the motor aspect of an emotional process. Besides, there are other ramifications such as "two-beat and "four-beat" Jazz, New Orleans and Chicago "styles," vocal and instrumental differences, etc. To go into the complex interactive factors involved in the historical development of Jazz's varieties of expression would require a book.

However, the problem of "time and melody" is incidental. The material of Jazz is a synthesis of musical ingredients including certain, specific scalar, harmonic and rhythmic patterns, plus unique uses of intonation, inflection, accentuation, instrumental "techniques" etc. There are also such over-all elements as tradition, attitude, relative instrumental freedom of expression, individual personality differences, etc. In view of the above, the reduction of Jazz to a "tension between time and melody" becomes an absurdity.

A few paragraphs later Mr. Steig tells us that Jazz is also "the exasperating counterplay of rhythm and melody, rule and feeling—is an exact abstract expression of the anxiety of everyday life." Here you have three different categories of experience neatly become synonomous. The counterplay of "rhythm and melody" is one thing, "rule and feeling" another and anxiety still another. Since a work of Art has an objective, autonomous existence, the attempt to explain its quality by means of a personality conflict in its creator becomes crude sleight-of-hand and reveals little understanding of both Art and human behavior.

JULES MODLIN.

NEW YORK CITY.

. . . It is hard to choose a strand at which to begin unravelling the clot of hemp with which I have been presented. However, perhaps one by one . . .

The fact that his "Commies" (I find this word in execrable taste) have made vulgar use of the question of art's relationship to its social ground need not discourage an understanding of this relationship.

I refuse to dip more than a toe into the puddle of my tormentor's second paragraph. He will discover on reflection that Pop Goes the Weasel fits his theme of integration of time and melody far better than does jazz.

The sample listing of the "material of Jazz" that appears in the third paragraph is no more pertinent than a laundry list. In view of the toe bones, the ankle bones, the leg bones and the thigh bone, a work on the chemistry of bone might be similarly absurd to Mr. Modlin.

I did not "reduce" jazz to a tension between time and melody. I said that this was its distinguishing characteristic. If I were to make the observation that Mr. Modlin is distinguished by confusion this could in no way slight the other, important but necessarily minor, facets of his personality.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now for the nightmare about the "three categories of experience become synonomous": We turn on the light, and lo! on the wall, framed in gold and crocheted in lavender letters on an ivory ground, appears the Elucidation: A RELATION IS NOT AN EQUATION.

Finally, Mr. Modlin's irrelevant coda: I did not deal with a "personality conflict" but a psychological pattern common to a people. And I did not "explain the quality" of a work of art but deliberated the spirit of an art form.

ARTHUR STEIG.

DRAWING THE LINE

SIR:

One aspect of the "responsibility of peoples" which seems worthy of further comment is the need for each individual to exercise some morality in choice of jobs. This is brought home rather strikingly by the fact that none of the thousands of workers engaged in the manufacture of atomic bombs knew what sort of weapon they were making.

Probably most of them would not have refused the job if they had known, but it suggests that those of us who have scruples must be on guard against such "secret" jobs. Where the implications of a job are hidden these days, it is usually a pretty dirty job.

Especially dangerous, it seems to me, is the idea of accepting questionable jobs in order to be "of service" to the people involved (the Negro leaders who have accepted personnel jobs in jimcrow shipyards, for example). Certainly it seems inadequate to enter such a plant for the sole purpose of organizing the workers on a business union basis. One's tacit approval of the job, unless countered by strong and constant propaganda against the job itself, would seem to be doing more harm than good in the long run.

Concretely, it seems to me that anti-war radicals in the postwar period can conscientiously enter consumer goods industries, where most of the product of their labor will be used peacefully—but I am doubtful of the morality of working in a heavy industry such as steel, where much of the product will go for "national defense," unless the work is accompanied by a pretty thorough anti-war propaganda which is directly related to the job and the plant. I wonder if you or other readers feel that this line is clearly or properly drawn.

J. H. MC CANDLESS.

ELKTON, ORE.

Comment

"... usually it was not the least like that."

The *N. Y. Times* of July 12 reported a speech made by Magistrate John Leale, president of the Controlling Committee of the State of Guernsey. Something of a scandal has arisen because of the discovery that the inhabitants of Guernsey and the other Channel Islands, the only British soil occupied by the Germans during the war, inclined to collaboration rather than resistance. In justifying this course, Magistrate Leale produced a very interesting piece of political theorizing. His arguments, not always so frankly expressed, are the basic ones of the Realistic and Positive school, whether it is a question of supporting World War II, or "cooperating" (so much nicer a word than "collaborating") with Russian imperial-

Complete your files of politics!

No. 1. February 1944.
Walter J. Oakes: **Toward a Permanent War Economy**
Dwight Macdonald: **A Theory of Popular Culture**

No. 2. March 1944.
Peter Meyer: **The Soviet Union, a New Class Society (Part 1)**
Daniel Bell: **The Coming Tragedy of American Labor**

No. 3. April 1944.
C. Wright Mills: **The Powerless People, or The Intellectual in Society**
Peter Meyer: **The Soviet Union, a New Class Society (Part Two)**

No. 4. May 1944.
Kurt List: **The Music of Soviet Russia**
George Padmore: **Anglo-American Condominium**

No. 5. June 1944.
Nicola Chiaromonte: **Croce and Italian Liberalism**
Isaac G. McNatt: **"I Was a Seabee"**

No. 6. July 1944.
Don Calhoun: **The Political Relevance of Conscientious Objection**
Dwight Macdonald: **How "Practical" is a Jim Crow Army?**

No. 7. August 1944.
Bruno Bettelheim: **Behavior in Extreme Situations** (Notes on a Year in Nazi Concentration Camps)
Wilfred H. Kerr: **"Negroism", Strange Fruit of Segregation**
Robert Duncan: **The Homosexual in Society**

No. 8. September 1944.
Dwight Macdonald: War as an Institution (1): **Notes on the Psychology of Killing**

No. 9. October 1944. . . . Exhausted.

No. 10. November 1944.
"Dual Power" in France — Hitherto Unpublished Documents
George Orwell: **The Ethics of the Detective Story**

No. 11. December 1944.
Llewellyn Queener: War as an Institution (3): **Inter-Enemy Ethics**

No. 12. January, 1945.
Greece: **the Full Story (1)**
"Gallicus": Hitler, the Liberals' "Indispensable Man"

No. 13. February, 1945.
Simone Weil: **Reflections on War**
Meyer Schapiro: **A Note on Max Weber's Politics**

No. 14. March, 1945.
Dwight Macdonald: **The Responsibility of Peoples**
Louis Clair: **The Stalintern Over Europe**

No. 15. April, 1945.
"Why Am I Fighting?"

No. 16. May, 1945.
Daniel Bell: **The Political Lag of Commonwealth**
The Gratsos Memorandum

No. 17 June, 1945.
Conscription & Conscientious Objection, a Symposium

No. 18. July, 1945.
Paul Goodman: **The Political Meaning of some Recent Revisions of Freud**
The Japanese People—3 Basic Books

No. 19. August, 1945.
Louis Clair: **The Peace Criminals**
Jean Malaquais: **Louis Aragon, or the Professional Patriot**
Text of General Patton's D-Day-Minus-One Speech

No. 20. September, 1945.
Nicola Chiaromonte: **Koestler, or Tragedy Made Futile**
Dwight Macdonald: **Labor Imperialism**
The Atomic Bomb—3 articles

The above issues cost 25¢ each, except for No. 9 (exhausted) and No. 12 (50¢).

$4.50 for all issues still in print (19).

Special Dollar Packet:—

Send us $1 and we will mail you the following 7 back issues: Nos. 6, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism, or, as with the Historic Peace Churches, participating in a Government plan for the control of CO's.

The citizens of Guernsey, for example, were confronted with the matter of some of their number being forcibly deported to the Continent, for slave labor or worse. "We had to decide," comments Leale, "whether we should cut ourselves completely adrift on the ground the thing was unclean, or take the point of view that if the deportations were due to take place, there was nothing we could do to prevent them. If we accepted the latter as our standpoint, we could work to insure that everything was conducted in an orderly fashion. We could try to get the maximum number of exemptions. We could organize so that everything humanly possible was done to lighten the burden of those who had to go. We chose the latter alternative. I don't think we would have gained anything except a little notoriety by the former . . . It is easy to talk big when you have no responsibilities on your shoulders."

This policy paid off: the German occupation of the Channel Islands was "comparatively" mild. And indeed why not? "The behavior of the people has, except for a few isolated instances, been seemly, sensible, realistic, and in harmony with the rules of international law. Ours has been, indeed, an occupation in which neither side went to spectacular extremes. When one hears in other places of war criminals and Quislings and the Gestapo as being its chief actors, one rather heaves a sigh of relief that ours wasn't that sort of occupation . . . There seemed to be a good deal of misunderstanding about our relations with the Germans. So many people assumed that we got orders, accompanied by threats, and so were tamed into submission. But usually it was not the least like that . . . My own view of the matter would be this: the Germans were human enough to prefer a quiet life to one of trouble."

As I noted here last winter, the one as-yet-undevaluated political dividing line to emerge in this war has been that between Resistance and Collaboration. The above is about as good a presentation of the case for the latter attitude as I have seen; that it echoes so much contemporary liblab* thinking should be a cause for disquiet.

GOVERNMENT OF, BY, AND FOR

The State (that's us) will undertake to feed
and uniform the Citizens (that's us),
instruct them in the arts of slaughter. Thus,
will we assure no fruit from martial seed.
Each man (that's us), our Thinkers think, will need
a year or two (or more) of Discipline,
of cultivation into regimen;
so, will we choke the Evil Fascist weed.
The State (that's us) abhors the War-like Foe
(whom we now crush to never rise again);
therefore shall we improve their method, so
that Trusting Friends will ever friends remain.
The Nation (we, the People) thus, insures
Democracy and Peace shall (must!) endure.

C. J. STEVENS

*Many readers have been puzzled by this word. It is not an abusive term (though the phonetic resemblance to flipflop, wishywashy, shillyshally, etc. is one of its undeniable charms) but an abbreviation for "liberal-labor". It has two advantages over "liberal": (1) broader reference in that it includes the politically more important part of the combination; (2) avoids suggesting the historic connotations of "liberalism", which are mostly not descriptive of the modern article. It is an English term; so far as I know, POLITICS was the first to give it currency over here.

Here Is What YOU Can Do:--

We have collected from our own files and from friends of the magazine, the addresses of a number of families abroad who desperately need food and clothing this winter. These people are fighters for the ideals the readers of "Politics" believe in. Some of them have returned from years of imprisonment in German concentration and even death camps, all of them have suffered and struggled for OUR cause. They are Socialists, Trotskyists, Anarchists, leftists of every shade. They are French, Italian, Dutch, German, etc.

There is no point in sending them money, since money will buy little in Europe today. (It costs $20 to get a pair of shoes resoled in France.) Food, clothing, soap, needles and thread—this is what is needed.

WILL YOU UNDERTAKE TO SEND FOOD PACKAGES REGULARLY TO A EUROPEAN FAMILY?

If so, fill out the blank below and we will send you one of the names in our files, together with full instructions as to size and weight allowed, how to mail, foods most needed, etc. We hope to arrange for each family to receive one food package a week (the maximum permitted). You may undertake to mail once a week, twice a month, or once a month, depending on the time and money you can spare. (The cost of each package, of course, depends on what you include. An average price, including postage, would run around $5.)

If you cannot, for any reason, send packages yourself, send us the money and we will buy the supplies and mail them ourselves.

Nothing will be spent for administration. Every penny will go for food. A group of people close to the magazine have undertaken to do, voluntarily, all the clerical work involved, and to mail out packages for such "Politics" readers as cannot mail them themselves.

P. S. It is hoped that, in addition to mailing packages to "your" family, you will also be able to correspond with them. Letters from *people over here, we know from experience, are eagerly welcomed* by Europeans, who have for years been cut off from contact with the rest of the world. By your packages, by your letters, you can show them that they are not forgotten, that they have friends over here, and *that international fraternity is not* ***completely*** *destroyed.*

Politics, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.

I want to help.

☐ Please send me the address of a European family, plus full mailing instructions. I will undertake to send them .....package(s) a month.

☐ I enclose $..... to pay for food packages. I will undertake to send you $..... a month to keep up the flow of packages this winter.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY..... UNIT..... STATE.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED